arXiv:1602.06043v1 [cs.LO] 19 Feb 2016

Private Names in Non-Commutative Logic

Ross Horne[1], Alwen Tiu[1], Bogdan Aman[2], and Gabriel Ciobanu[2]

1 **School of Computer Engineering, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore**
rhorne@ntu.edu.sg, atiu@ntu.edu.sg
2 **Romanian Academy, Institute of Computer Science, Blvd. Carol I no.8, 700505 Iaşi, Romania**
bogdan.aman@iit.academiaromana-is.ro, gabriel@info.uaic.ro

Abstract

We present an expressive but decidable first-order system (named MAV1) defined by using the calculus of structures, a generalisation of the sequent calculus. In addition to first-order universal and existential quantifiers the system incorporates a pair of nominal quantifiers called 'new' and 'wen', distinct from the self-dual Gabbay-Pitts and Miller-Tiu nominal quantifiers. The novelty of these operators is they are polarised in the sense that 'new' distributes over positive operators while 'wen' distributes over negative operators. This greater control of bookkeeping enables private names to be modelled as required in applications such as the verification of security protocols. Due to the presence of a self-dual non-commutative operator, a direct proof of cut elimination for first-order quantifiers in the calculus of structures is necessary; contrasting to related results for first-order quantifiers in the calculus of structures which rely on a correspondence with the sequent calculus. As a consequence of cut elimination, the complexity classes for provability in MAV1 and several sub-systems are established.

1998 ACM Subject Classification F.4.1 Mathematical Logic; F.1.1 Models of Computation

1 Introduction

The subject of study is a first-order non-commutative logic expressed in a formalism called the calculus of structures [20, 47, 21, 46]. The calculus of structures can be used to express proof systems that combine connectives for sequentiality and parallelism. The calculus of structures is effectively a term rewriting system modulo a congruence that enjoys desirable proof theoretical properties. In this paper, we assume that the reader is comfortable with basic term rewriting, and introduce minimal terminology in order to obtain the key results.

The calculus of structures was motivated by a need for understanding why pomset logic [39] could not be expressed in the sequent calculus. Pomset logic is a logic inspired by pomsets [38] and linear logic [18], the former being a model of concurrency respecting causality [42], while the latter can be interpreted in various ways as a logic of resources and concurrency [11, 25, 52]. Acknowledging connections between pomsets, linear logic and concurrency, a natural question would be: "what new results can the calculus of structures bring to concurrency theory?" This paper is part of a line of work addressing this question. Initial investigations have been conducted in [9] relating a fragment of CCS [33] to a proof system in the calculus of structures called BV [20], where it is demonstrated that completed traces of a process have a logical characterisation and that logical equivalence implies completed trace equivalence. Recently, BV has been extended with additives to obtain the system MAV [23], enabling a discussion on branching-time preorders. Results concerning multi-party compatibility and sub-typing in a session type system inspired by Scribble [22] have been established using MAV [14].

This paper continues the above line of work by considering a conservative extension of MAV with first-order quantifiers, named MAV1. The system MAV1 is also a conservative extension of first-order multiplicative additive linear logic MALL1 [30] with mix. A novelty of the system presented is the pair of nominal quantifiers pronounced 'new' and 'wen' and written И and Э respectively. These

© Ross Horne, Alwen Tiu, Bogdan Aman and Gabriel Ciobanu;
licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY
Submitted for review 18/2/2016.
Editor: Unpublished submission only. Please contact the authors before citing.; pp. 1–48

Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics
Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

quantifiers were first suggested in an informal note [19] that considers modelling processes with private names as embeddings in logic.

Since trace equivalence is among the weakest equivalence relations for processes [49], it makes sense to impose a minimum requirement that logical implication should be sound with respect to trace inclusion, and that logical equivalence implies trace equivalence. To extend results for completed trace equivalence [9] to the π-calculus, we require an encoding of the restriction operator ν of the π-calculus. If we are to interpret the restriction operator as a logical operator, naturally the only possibilities are the quantifiers. We discuss possible choices of quantifiers below. In the following illustration, suppose $\overline{a}x$ is a process that outputs x on a channel a and then terminates, and $\overline{b}x$ is another process that does the same but on channel b. Observe that $R_1 = \nu x.(\overline{a}x \mid \overline{b}x)$ is a process that can output a fresh name twice — once on channel a and once on channel b; and, more importantly, it cannot output two distinct names in any execution. On the other hand, observe that the process $R_2 = \nu x.\overline{a}x \mid \nu x.\overline{b}x$ is a process that outputs two distinct fresh names before terminating, but cannot output the same name twice in any execution. We also assume parallel composition of processes is encoded using the *par* operator $\parr$ of linear logic.

For an encoding using universal quantifiers, the processes R_1 and R_2 are respectively encoded as predicates $F_1 = \forall x.\left(\overline{ax} \parr \overline{bx}\right)$ and $F_2 = \forall x.\overline{ax} \parr \forall x.\overline{bx}$. For these predicates, we have the implication $F_2 \multimap F_1$. But clearly R_1 has a trace that cannot be produced by R_2, so implication would not be sound with respect to trace inclusion. Additionally, we must also avoid the following 'diagonalization' property [32] that is again unsound with respect to trace semantics: $\forall x.\forall y.P(x,y) \multimap \forall z.P(z,z)$.

The self-dual nominal quantifiers of either Gabbay-Pitts [37] or Miller-Tiu [32, 17], as recently investigated in the calculus of structures [40], do successfully avoid the above 'diagonalization' property. Unfortunately, rather surprisingly, encoding private names using any of these self-dual nominal quantifiers, say ∇, leads to the following problem. Suppose processes R_1 and R_2 are encoded by the respective predicates $G_1 = \nabla x.(\overline{ax} \parr \overline{bx})$ and $G_2 = \nabla x.\overline{ax} \parr \nabla x.\overline{bx}$. In this case, we have that $G_1 \multimap G_2$. This implication is also unsound, since R_1 has a trace that outputs two identical names, whereas R_2 admits no such trace. The scenario of an encoding using $\exists$ also suffers from the above problem, as well as the dual 'diagonalization' property.

Thus, to enable a sound embedding of π-processes as predicates, it is necessary to develop a quantifier that does not distribute over the *par* operator. With these restrictions in place, we discover that the self-dual nominal quantifier decomposes into a dual pair of nominal quantifiers $\mathit{И}$ and $\Э$, that sit between $\forall$ and $\exists$ as follows: $\forall x.P \multimap \mathit{И}x.P$ and $\mathit{И}x.P \multimap \Э x.P$ and $\Э x.P \multimap \exists x.P$. In other words, our quantifier $\mathit{И}$ is similar in some respects to $\forall$, whereas $\Э$ is similar to $\exists$. In terms of proof theory, the crucial difference between $\exists x.P$ and $\Э x.P$ is that the variable x in the latter cannot be instantiated with arbitrary terms, but only 'fresh' names introduced by $\mathit{И}$.

The long term aim is to demonstrate the applications of MAV1 to the verification of protocols. However, since this is a new logical system it is necessary to firstly prove the consistency of the system, which we approach in proof theoretic style through cut elimination. The body of this paper is concerned with settling the problem of cut elimination. Note that existing cut elimination proofs involving first-order quantifiers in the calculus of structures [8] rely on a correspondence with the sequent calculus that is impossible in the presence of the self-dual non-commutative operator *seq*.

Structure of paper. Section 2 introduces the syntax and semantics of MAV1. Section 3 settles cut elimination for MAV1. Section 4 summarises complexity classes for sub-systems of MAV1.

The symbol $\Э$ follows the tradition of Gabbay and Pitts of using Cyrillic vowels for nominal quantifiers. This vowel is pronounced as e in 'wen' and reminds the reader of its existential nature.

2 Syntax and Semantics of Predicates in MAV1

In this section we present the syntax and semantics of a first-order system expressed in the calculus of structures, with the technical name MAV1. We assume that the reader has a basic understanding of term-rewriting systems [31].

A term-rewriting system requires an *abstract syntax*, defined in Fig. 1. The *rewrite rules*, in Fig 3, define rules that can be applied to rewrite a predicate of the form on the left of the long right arrow to the predicate on the right. All rewrite rules can be applied in any context, i.e. MAV1 predicates from Fig. 1 with a hole of the following form $C\{\ \} ::= \{\ \cdot\ \} \mid C\{\ \} \odot P \mid P \odot C\{\ \} \mid \mathcal{O}x.C\{\ \}$, where $\odot \in \{;, \parr, \otimes, \&, \oplus\}$ and $\mathcal{O} \in \{\exists, \forall, \mathit{И}, \ni\}$.

Further to rewriting according to rules, the term-rewriting system is defined *modulo a congruence*, where a congruence is an equivalence relation that holds in any context. The congruence, defined in Fig. 2, makes *par* and *times* commutative and *seq* non-commutative in general. The congruence enables α-conversion for quantifiers. In addition, *equivariance* allows names bound by successive nominal quantifiers to be swapped.

As standard, we define a freshness predicate such that a variable x is fresh for a predicate P, written $x \# P$, if and only if x is not a member of the set of free variables of P, such that all quantifiers bind variables in their scope. We also assume the standard notion of capture avoiding substitution of a variable for a term. Terms may be constructed from variables, constants and function symbols.

$P ::=$	α	(atom)
	$\overline{\alpha}$	(co-atom)
	1	(unit)
	$\forall x P$	(all)
	$\exists x P$	(some)
	$\mathit{И} x P$	(new)
	$\ni x P$	(wen)
	$P \,\&\, P$	(with)
	$P \oplus P$	(plus)
	$P \parr P$	(par)
	$P \otimes P$	(times)
	$P\ ;\ P$	(seq)

Figure 1 *MAV1* syntax.

We postpone a discussion on the rules until after we introduce the notion of a proof and explain cut elimination in the next section.

3 Linear Implication and Cut Elimination

This section confirms that MAV1 is a consistent logical system, as established by a cut elimination theorem. To date, the only direct proof of cut elimination involving quantifiers in the literature is for a self-dual nominal quantifier [40] distinct from any quantifier in MAV1. Related cut elimination results involving first-order quantifiers in the calculus of structures rely on a correspondence with the sequent calculus [8, 45]. However, due to the presence of the non-commutative operator *seq* there is no sequent calculus presentation [47] for MAV1; hence we pursue here a direct proof.

A derivation is any sequence of zero or more rewrite rules from Fig. 3, where the congruence in Fig. 2 can be applied at any point. We are particularly interested in special derivations, called proofs.

▶ **Definition 1.** A *proof* in MAV1 is a derivation $P \longrightarrow 1$ from a predicate P to the unit. When such a derivation exists, we say that P is provable, and write $\vdash P$.

$(P, \parr, 1)$ and $(P, \otimes, 1)$ are commutative monoids $\quad \mathcal{O}xP \equiv \mathcal{O}y\,(P\{^{y}/_{x}\})$ if $y \# \mathcal{O}xP$ (α-conversion)

$(P, ;, 1)$ is a monoid $\quad \mathit{И}x\mathit{И}yP \equiv \mathit{И}y\mathit{И}xP$ (equivariance) $\quad \ni x \ni yP \equiv \ni y \ni xP$ (equivariance)

Figure 2 Congruence ($\equiv$) for MAV1 predicates. For α-conversion $\mathcal{O} \in \{\exists, \forall, \mathit{И}, \ni\}$ is any quantifier.

$$C\{\ \overline{\alpha} \parallel \alpha\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \mathrm{I}\ \} \quad \text{(atomic interaction)} \qquad C\{\ P \parallel (Q \otimes S)\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ (P \parallel Q) \otimes S\ \} \quad \text{(switch)}$$

$$C\{\ (P\ ;\ Q) \parallel (R\ ;\ S)\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ (P \parallel R)\ ;\ (Q \parallel S)\ \} \quad \text{(sequence)}$$

$$C\{\ (P\ \&\ Q) \parallel R\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ (P \parallel R)\ \&\ (Q \parallel R)\ \} \quad \text{(external)} \qquad C\{\ \mathrm{I}\ \&\ \mathrm{I}\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \mathrm{I}\ \} \quad \text{(tidy)}$$

$$C\{\ (P\ ;\ Q)\ \&\ (R\ ;\ S)\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ (P\ \&\ R)\ ;\ (Q\ \&\ S)\ \} \quad \text{(medial)}$$

$$C\{\ P \oplus Q\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ P\ \} \quad \text{(left choice)} \qquad C\{\ P \oplus Q\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ Q\ \} \quad \text{(right choice)}$$

$$C\{\ \forall x P \parallel R\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \forall x\,(P \parallel R)\ \} \text{ only if } x \# R \quad \text{(extrude1)} \qquad C\{\ \forall x^{\mathrm{I}}\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \mathrm{I}\ \} \quad \text{(tidy1)}$$

$$C\{\ \forall x\,(P\ ;\ S)\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \forall x P\ ;\ \forall x S\ \} \quad \text{(medial1)} \qquad C\{\ \exists x P\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ P\{^{v}/_{x}\}\ \} \quad \text{(select1)}$$

$$C\{\ \text{И}x P \parallel \text{Э}x Q\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \text{И}x\,(P \parallel Q)\ \} \quad \text{(close)} \qquad C\{\ \text{И}x^{\mathrm{I}}\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \mathrm{I}\ \} \quad \text{(tidy name)}$$

$$C\{\ \text{И}x P \parallel R\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \text{И}x\,(P \parallel R)\ \} \text{ only if } x \# R \quad \text{(extrude new)}$$

$$C\{\ \text{Э}x P\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \text{И}x P\ \} \quad \text{(fresh)} \qquad C\{\ \text{И}x\text{Э}y P\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \text{Э}y\text{И}x P\ \} \quad \text{(new wen)}$$

$$C\{\ \text{И}x\,(P\ ;\ S)\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \text{И}x P\ ;\ \text{И}x S\ \} \quad \text{(medial new)}$$

$$C\{\ \text{Э}x P \odot \text{Э}x S\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \text{Э}x\,(P \odot S)\ \} \text{ where } \odot \in \{\parallel, ;\} \quad \text{(medial wen)}$$

$$C\{\ \text{Э}x P \odot R\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \text{Э}x\,(P \odot R)\ \} \text{ where } \odot \in \{\parallel, ;\} \text{ only if } x \# R \quad \text{(left wen)}$$

$$C\{\ R \odot \text{Э}x Q\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \text{Э}x\,(R \odot Q)\ \} \text{ where } \odot \in \{\parallel, ;\} \text{ only if } x \# R \quad \text{(right wen)}$$

$$C\{\ \forall x \text{Ю} y P\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \text{Ю}y \forall x P\ \} \text{ for } \text{Ю} \in \{\text{И}, \text{Э}\} \quad \text{(all name)}$$

$$C\{\ \text{Ю}x P\ \&\ \text{Ю}x S\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \text{Ю}x\,(P\ \&\ S)\ \} \text{ for } \text{Ю} \in \{\text{И}, \text{Э}\} \quad \text{(with name)}$$

$$C\{\ \text{Ю}x P\ \&\ R\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \text{Ю}x\,(P\ \&\ R)\ \} \text{ only if } x \# R \text{ for } \text{Ю} \in \{\text{И}, \text{Э}\} \quad \text{(left name)}$$

$$C\{\ R\ \&\ \text{Ю}x Q\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \text{Ю}x\,(R\ \&\ Q)\ \} \text{ only if } x \# R \text{ for } \text{Ю} \in \{\text{И}, \text{Э}\} \quad \text{(right name)}$$

Figure 3 Rewrite rules for predicates in system MAV1. Notice the figure is divided into four parts. The first part defines sub-system BV [20]. The first and second parts together define sub-system MAV [23]. The first, third and fourth parts together are called sub-system BV1. The following restrictions are placed on the rules to ensure the system is analytic [10].

- The *switch*, *sequence*, *medial1*, *medial new* and *extrude new* rules are such that $P \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ and $S \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$.
- The *medial* rule is such that either $P \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ or $R \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ and also either $Q \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ or $S \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$.
- The rules *external*, *extrude1*, *extrude new*, *left wen* and *right wen* are such that $R \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$.

A *derivation* is a sequence of rewrites, where the congruence can be applied at any point in a derivation. The length of a derivation involving only the congruence of Fig. 2 is zero. The length of a derivation involving one rule from Fig. 3 is one. Given a derivation $P \longrightarrow Q$ of length m and another $Q \longrightarrow R$ of length n, the derivation $P \longrightarrow R$ is of length $m + n$. Unless we make it clear in the context that we refer to a specific rule, $\longrightarrow$ is generally used to represent derivations of any length.

To explore the theory of proofs, two auxiliary definitions are introduced: linear negation and linear implication. Notice in the syntax in Fig. 1 linear negation applies only to atoms.

▶ **Definition 2.** *Linear negation* is defined by the following function from predicates to predicates.

$$\overline{\overline{\alpha}} = \alpha \qquad \overline{P \otimes Q} = \overline{P} \parr \overline{Q} \qquad \overline{P \parr Q} = \overline{P} \otimes \overline{Q} \qquad \overline{P \oplus Q} = \overline{P} \,\&\, \overline{Q} \qquad \overline{P \,\&\, Q} = \overline{P} \oplus \overline{Q}$$
$$\overline{\mathrm{I}} = \mathrm{I} \qquad \overline{P \mathbin{;} Q} = \overline{P} \mathbin{;} \overline{Q} \qquad \overline{\forall x P} = \exists x \overline{P} \qquad \overline{\exists x P} = \forall x \overline{P} \qquad \overline{\text{И} x P} = \ni x \overline{P} \qquad \overline{\ni x P} = \text{И} x \overline{P}$$

Linear implication, written $P \multimap Q$, is defined as $\overline{P} \parr Q$.

Linear negation defines de Morgan dualities. As in linear logic, the multiplicatives $\otimes$ and $\parr$ are de Morgan dual, as are the additives $\&$ and $\oplus$, the first-order quantifiers $\exists$ and $\forall$, and the nominal quantifiers И and $\ni$. As in BV, sequential composition and the unit are self-dual.

The following proposition is simply a reflexivity property of linear implication in MAV1.

▶ **Proposition 3** (Reflexivity)**.** *For any predicate P, $\vdash \overline{P} \parr P$ holds.*

Proof. The proof proceeds by induction on the structure of a predicate P. The base cases for any atom α follows immediately from the atomic interaction rule. Since subsorting over atoms is reflexive, $\vdash \overline{\alpha} \parr \alpha$. The base case for the unit is immediate by definition of a proof.

For the induction hypothesis assume that $\vdash \overline{T} \parr T$ and $\vdash \overline{U} \parr U$. Thereby, the following cases hold.

Consider when the root connective in the predicate is the $\otimes$ operator. The following proof holds, by switch and the induction hypothesis.

$$\overline{(T \otimes U)} \parr (T \otimes U) = \overline{T} \parr \overline{U} \parr (T \otimes U) \longrightarrow \left(\overline{T} \parr T\right) \otimes \left(\overline{U} \parr U\right) \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$$

The case when the root connective is the par operator is symmetric to the above.

Consider when the root connective in the predicate is the seq operator. The following proof holds, by the sequence rule and the induction hypothesis.

$$\overline{(T \mathbin{;} U)} \parr (T \mathbin{;} U) = \left(\overline{T} \mathbin{;} \overline{U}\right) \parr (T \mathbin{;} U) \longrightarrow \left(\overline{T} \parr T\right) \mathbin{;} \left(\overline{U} \parr U\right) \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$$

Consider when the root connective in the predicate is &, the external choice operator. By induction, distributivity, choice, and tidy, the following proof holds.

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{(T \,\&\, U)} \parr (T \,\&\, U) = {} & \left(\overline{T} \oplus \overline{U}\right) \parr (T \,\&\, U) \\ \longrightarrow {} & \left(\left(\overline{T} \oplus \overline{U}\right) \parr T\right) \,\&\, \left(\left(\overline{T} \oplus \overline{U}\right) \parr U\right) \longrightarrow \left(\overline{T} \parr T\right) \,\&\, \left(\overline{U} \parr U\right) \longrightarrow \mathrm{I} \,\&\, \mathrm{I} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I} \end{aligned}$$

The case for when internal choice, $\oplus$, is the root connective is symmetric to the case for external choice.

Consider when the root connective in the predicate is $\forall$. By induction, the following proof holds.

$$\overline{\forall x T} \parr \forall x T = \exists x T \parr \forall x T \longrightarrow \forall x \left(\exists x T \parr T\right) \longrightarrow \forall x \left(T \parr T\right) \longrightarrow \forall x \mathrm{I} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$$

The case for when $\exists$ is the root connective is symmetric to the case for $\forall$.

Consider when the root connective in the predicate is И. By induction, the following proof holds.

$$\overline{\text{И} x T} \parr \text{И} x T = \ni x \overline{T} \parr \text{И} x T \longrightarrow \text{И} x \left(\overline{T} \parr T\right) \longrightarrow \text{И} x \mathrm{I} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$$

The case for when the root connective is $\ni$ is similar.

Hence, by induction on the size of the predicate, reflexivity holds. □

The main result of this paper is the following, which is a generalisation of *cut elimination* to the setting of the calculus of structures.

▶ **Theorem 4** (Cut elimination). *For any predicate P, if* $\vdash C\{\ P \otimes \overline{P}\ \}$ *holds, then* $\vdash C\{\ \mathrm{I}\ \}$ *holds.*

The above theorem can be stated alternatively by supposing that there is a proof in MAV1 extended with the extra rewrite rule: $C\{\ \mathrm{I}\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ P \otimes \overline{P}\ \}$ (cut). Given such a proof, a new proof can be constructed that uses only the rules of MAV1. In this formulation, we say that *cut* is *admissible*.

The proof of Theorem 4 for the sub-system MAV appears in a companion journal paper [23]. This paper extends the cut-elimination techniques for MAV to MAV1, as established by the lemmas in later subsections. Before proceeding with the necessary lemmas, we provide a corollary that demonstrates that one of many consequences of cut elimination is indeed that linear implication defines a precongruence — a reflexive transitive relation that holds in any context.

▶ **Corollary 5.** *Linear implication defines a precongruence.*

Proof. For reflexivity, $T \multimap T$ holds immediately by Proposition 3.

For transitivity, suppose that $\vdash T \multimap U$ and $\vdash U \multimap V$ hold. Thereby the following proof can be constructed.

$$\left(\overline{T} \parallel \left(U \otimes \overline{U}\right) \parallel V\right) \longrightarrow \left(\overline{T} \parallel U\right) \otimes \left(\overline{U} \parallel V\right) \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$$

Hence, by Theorem 4, $\vdash \overline{T} \parallel V$ as required.

For contextual closure, assume that $\vdash T \multimap U$ holds. By Proposition 3, and switch we can construct the following proof.

$$\overline{C\{\ T\ \}} \parallel C\{\ \left(T \otimes \overline{T}\right) \parallel U\ \} \longrightarrow \overline{C\{\ T\ \}} \parallel C\{\ T \otimes \left(\overline{T} \parallel U\right)\ \} \longrightarrow \overline{C\{\ T\ \}} \parallel C\{\ T\ \} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$$

Hence by Theorem 4, $\vdash \overline{C\{\ T\ \}} \parallel C\{\ U\ \}$ as required. □

3.1 Discussion on the Rules for Nominal Quantifiers.

The rules for the nominal quantifiers *new* N and *wen* $\Im$ require some justification. The *close* and *tidy name* rules ensure the reflexivity of implication for nominal quantifiers. Using the *extrude new* rule (and Proposition 3) we can establish the following proof, and its dual statement $\vdash \Im xP \multimap \exists xP$.

$$\vdash \forall xP \multimap \mathsf{N}xP = \exists x\overline{P} \parallel \mathsf{N}xP \longrightarrow \mathsf{N}x\left(\exists x\overline{P} \parallel P\right) \longrightarrow \mathsf{N}x\left(\overline{P} \parallel P\right) \longrightarrow \mathsf{N}x\mathrm{I} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$$

Using the *fresh* rule we can establish the following implication between *new* and *wen*.

$$\vdash \mathsf{N}xP \multimap \Im xP = \Im x\overline{P} \parallel \Im xP \longrightarrow \mathsf{N}x\overline{P} \parallel \Im xP \longrightarrow \mathsf{N}x\left(\overline{P} \parallel P\right) \longrightarrow \mathsf{N}x\mathrm{I} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$$

This completes the chain $\vdash \forall xP \multimap \mathsf{N}xP$, $\vdash \mathsf{N}xP \multimap \Im xP$ and $\vdash \Im xP \multimap \exists xP$. These linear implications are strict unless $x \# P$, in which case, for all quantifiers $\mathcal{O} \in \{\forall, \exists, \mathsf{N}, \Im\}$, $\mathcal{O}xP$ is logically equivalent to P. For example, using the *fresh* and *extrude new* rules, the following holds given $x \# P$.

$$\vdash \mathsf{N}xP \multimap P = \Im x\overline{P} \parallel P \longrightarrow \mathsf{N}x\overline{P} \parallel P \longrightarrow \mathsf{N}x\left(\overline{P} \parallel P\right) \longrightarrow \mathsf{N}x\mathrm{I} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$$

Alternatively, the *extrude new* and *fresh* rules could be replaced by extending the congruence with $\mathsf{N}xP \equiv P \equiv \Im xP$, where $x \# P$. However, this has the disadvantage that an arbitrary number of nominal quantifiers can be introduced during proof search thereby jeopardising analyticity.

The *medial new* rule is particular to handling nominals in the presence of the self-dual non-commutative operator *seq*. To see why this medial rule cannot be excluded, consider the following.

$$(a\ ;\ \Im x\,(b\ ;\ c)) \otimes (d\ ;\ \Im x\,(e\ ;\ f)) \multimap (a\ ;\ \exists xb\ ;\ \exists xc) \otimes (d\ ;\ \exists xe\ ;\ \exists xf)$$
$$(a\ ;\ \exists xb\ ;\ \exists xc) \otimes (d\ ;\ \exists xe\ ;\ \exists xf) \multimap ((a\ ;\ \exists xb) \otimes (d\ ;\ \exists xe))\ ;\ (\exists xc \otimes \exists xf)$$

Without using the *medial new* rule, the above predicates are provable but the following predicate would not be provable; hence cut elimination cannot hold without the *medial new* rule.

$$(a \mathbin{;} \Im x\,(b \mathbin{;} c)) \otimes (d \mathbin{;} \Im x\,(e \mathbin{;} f)) \multimap ((a \mathbin{;} \exists x b) \otimes (d \mathbin{;} \exists x e)) \mathbin{;} (\exists x c \otimes \exists x f)$$

In contrast, with the *medial new* rule the above predicate is provable, verified by the following proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\overline{a} \mathbin{;} И x\left(\overline{b} \mathbin{;} \overline{c}\right)\right) \parallel \left(\overline{d} \mathbin{;} И x\left(\overline{e} \mathbin{;} \overline{f}\right)\right) \parallel ((a \mathbin{;} \exists x b) \otimes (d \mathbin{;} \exists x e)) \mathbin{;} (\exists x c \otimes \exists x f)\\
&\quad\longrightarrow\quad \left(\overline{a} \mathbin{;} И x\overline{b} \mathbin{;} И x\overline{c}\right) \parallel \left(\overline{d} \mathbin{;} И x\overline{e} \mathbin{;} И x\overline{f}\right) \parallel ((a \mathbin{;} \exists x b) \otimes (d \mathbin{;} \exists x e)) \mathbin{;} (\exists x c \otimes \exists x f)\\
&\quad\longrightarrow\quad \left(\left(\overline{a} \mathbin{;} И x\overline{b}\right) \parallel \left(\overline{d} \mathbin{;} И x\overline{e}\right)\right) \mathbin{;} \left(И x\overline{c} \parallel И x\overline{f}\right) \parallel ((a \mathbin{;} \exists x b) \otimes (d \mathbin{;} \exists x e)) \mathbin{;} (\exists x c \otimes \exists x f)\\
&\quad\longrightarrow\quad \left(\left(\overline{a} \mathbin{;} И x\overline{b}\right) \parallel \left(\overline{d} \mathbin{;} И x\overline{e}\right) \parallel ((a \mathbin{;} \exists x b) \otimes (d \mathbin{;} \exists x e))\right) \mathbin{;} \left(И x\overline{c} \parallel И x\overline{f} \parallel (\exists x c \otimes \exists x f)\right)\\
&\quad\longrightarrow\quad \left(\left(\left(\overline{a} \mathbin{;} И x\overline{b}\right) \parallel (a \mathbin{;} \exists x b)\right) \otimes \left(\left(\overline{d} \mathbin{;} И x\overline{e}\right) \parallel (d \mathbin{;} \exists x e)\right)\right) \mathbin{;} \left((И x\overline{c} \parallel \exists x c) \otimes \left(И x\overline{f} \parallel \exists x f\right)\right)\\
&\quad\longrightarrow\quad \left(\left((\overline{a} \parallel a) \mathbin{;} \left(И x\overline{b} \parallel \exists x b\right)\right) \otimes \left(\left(\overline{d} \parallel d\right) \mathbin{;} (И x\overline{e} \parallel \exists x e)\right)\right) \mathbin{;} \left((И x\overline{c} \parallel \exists x c) \otimes \left(И x\overline{f} \parallel \exists x f\right)\right)\\
&\quad\longrightarrow\quad \left(\left((\overline{a} \parallel a) \mathbin{;} И x\left(\overline{b} \parallel \exists x b\right)\right) \otimes \left(\left(\overline{d} \parallel d\right) \mathbin{;} И x\,(\overline{e} \parallel \exists x e)\right)\right) \mathbin{;} \left(И x\,(\overline{c} \parallel \exists x c) \otimes И x\left(\overline{f} \parallel \exists x f\right)\right)\\
&\quad\longrightarrow\quad \left(\left((\overline{a} \parallel a) \mathbin{;} И x\left(\overline{b} \parallel b\right)\right) \otimes \left(\left(\overline{d} \parallel d\right) \mathbin{;} И x\,(\overline{e} \parallel e)\right)\right) \mathbin{;} \left(И x\,(\overline{c} \parallel c) \otimes И x\left(\overline{f} \parallel f\right)\right)\\
&\quad\longrightarrow\quad (И x\mathrm{I} \otimes И x\mathrm{I}) \mathbin{;} (И x\mathrm{I} \otimes И x\mathrm{I}) \quad\longrightarrow \mathrm{I}
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that the above proof uses only the *medial new*, *extrude new* and *tidy name* rules for nominals. These three rules are of the same form as the rules for universal quantifiers, hence the same argument holds for the necessity of the *medial1* rule.

Including the *medial new* rule forces the *medial wen* rule to be included. To see this observe that $(И x a \mathbin{;} И x b) \otimes (И x c \mathbin{;} И x d) \multimap И x\,(a \mathbin{;} b) \otimes И x\,(c \mathbin{;} d)$ and $И x\,(a \mathbin{;} b) \otimes И x\,(c \mathbin{;} d) \multimap И x\,((a \mathbin{;} b) \otimes (c \mathbin{;} d))$ are provable. However, without the *medial wen* the following implication is not provable, which would contradict the main cut elimination result of this paper.

$$(И x a \mathbin{;} И x b) \otimes (И x c \mathbin{;} И x d) \multimap И x\,((a \mathbin{;} b) \otimes (c \mathbin{;} d))$$

Fortunately, including the *medial wen* ensures that the above implication is provable. A similar argument justifies the inclusion of the *left wen* and *right wen* rules.

Consider $\parallel$, &, $\forall$, $И$ to be negative operators, in the sense of focussing [3]; and $\otimes$, $\oplus$, $\exists$ and $\Im$ to be positive operators, where *seq* is both positive and negative. The *new* quantifier distributes over all positive operators. Considering positive operator *tensor* for example, $\vdash И x\alpha \otimes И x\beta \multimap И x\,(\alpha \otimes \beta)$ holds but the converse implication does not hold. Furthermore, assuming x appears free in α and β, $\Im x\alpha \otimes \Im x\beta$ and $\Im x\,(\alpha \otimes \beta)$ are unrelated by linear implication. Dually, for the negative operator *par* the only distributivity property that holds for nominal quantifiers is $\vdash \Im x\,(\alpha \parallel \beta) \multimap \Im x\alpha \parallel \Im x\beta$. The *new wen* rule completes this picture of *new* distributing over positive operators and *wen* distributing over negative operators. From the perspective of embedding name-passing process calculi in logic, the above distributivity properties of *new* and *wen* suggest that processes should be encoded using negative operators $И$ and $\parallel$ for private names and parallel composition (or perhaps dually, using positive operators $\Im$ and $\otimes$), so as to avoid private names distributing over parallel composition, which we have shown to be problematic (see Section 1).

The control of distributivity exercised by *new* and *wen* contrast with the situation for universal and existential quantifiers, where $\exists$ commutes in one direction over all operators and $\forall$ commutes with all operators in the opposite direction. For a system with *equivariance* some of these distributivity properties for $И$ over & and $\forall$ are explicit rules *all name*, *with name*, *left name*, *right name*. These rules allow $И$ quantifiers to propagate to the front of certain contexts. In the sense of control of distributivity [6], *new* and *wen* behave more like multiplicatives than additives, but are unrelated to multiplicative quantifiers in the logic of bunched implications [36].

3.2 Observations Relating Behavioural and Logical Equivalences.

We now discuss briefly the connection between MAV1 and the π-calculus. This illustrates the rationale behind design decisions in MAV1. Stronger connections between process calculi and MAV1 will be exposed in a forthcoming paper. We assume the reader is familiar with the syntax of the π-calculus. For the π-calculus define an embedding of processes-as-predicates as follows.

$$[\![a(x).P]\!]_\pi = \exists x\,(ax\,;\,[\![P]\!]_\pi) \qquad [\![\overline{a}b.P]\!]_\pi = \overline{ax}\,;\,[\![P]\!]_\pi \qquad [\![P \mid Q]\!]_\pi = [\![P]\!]_\pi \parr [\![Q]\!]_\pi$$
$$[\![\nu x.P]\!]_\pi = \mathit{И}x\,[\![P]\!]_\pi \qquad [\![P + Q]\!]_\pi = [\![P]\!]_\pi \oplus [\![Q]\!]_\pi \qquad [\![\checkmark]\!]_\pi = \mathrm{I}$$

We consider preorders that are *weak*, hence do not observe τ actions, and *termination sensitive* [1, 51], hence distinguish between successful termination and deadlock. Successful termination is indicated by a process $\checkmark$, differing from 0 typical of process calculi. For example $P + \checkmark$ represents the process that may behave like P or may successfully terminate, contrasting to $P + 0$ which only has the option of proceeding as P. This distinction is useful for modelling protocols; for example, we can choose to perform no action in certain executions without deadlocking. Furthermore, $\checkmark$ as a primitive process matches the unit inherited from BV. Otherwise, the semantics are standard for the π-calculus.

Define labelled transitions for the π-calculus by the following deductive system, plus the symmetric rules for parallel composition and choice. Function $n(.)$ is such that $n(a(x)) = \{a, x\}$, $n(\overline{a}(x)) = \{a, x\}$ and $n(\overline{a}b) = \{a, b\}$, also $x \# P$ is such that x is fresh for P where $a(x).P$ and $\nu x.P$ bind x in P.

$$\frac{}{a(x).P \xrightarrow{a(y)} P\{^y/_x\}}\; y \# a(x).P \qquad \frac{}{\overline{a}b.P \xrightarrow{\overline{a}b} P} \qquad \frac{}{\checkmark \xrightarrow{\tau} \checkmark} \qquad \frac{P \xrightarrow{A} Q}{P + R \xrightarrow{A} Q}$$

$$\frac{P \xrightarrow{A} Q}{\nu x.P \xrightarrow{A} \nu x.Q}\; x \notin \mathrm{n}(A) \qquad \frac{P \xrightarrow{A} Q}{P \parr R \xrightarrow{A} Q \parr R}\; \begin{array}{l}\text{if } A = a(x) \text{ or } A = \overline{a}(x)\\ \text{then } x \# R\end{array}$$

$$\frac{P \xrightarrow{ax} Q}{\nu x.P \xrightarrow{a(x)} Q}\; a \neq x \qquad \frac{P \xrightarrow{\overline{a}(x)} P' \quad Q \xrightarrow{a(x)} Q'}{P \parr Q \xrightarrow{\tau} \nu x.\,(P' \parr Q')} \qquad \frac{P \xrightarrow{\overline{a}b} P' \quad Q \xrightarrow{a(x)} Q'}{P \parr Q \xrightarrow{\tau} P' \parr Q'\left\{^b/_x\right\}}$$

Define (symbolic weak) completed traces inductively as follows.

- For any process P formed using only the unit, name restriction and parallel composition (i.e. with no actions or choice) P has the completed trace I.
- If $P \xrightarrow{a(x)} Q$ and Q has completed trace tr then P has completed trace $\forall x\,(\overline{ax}\,;\,tr)$.
- If $P \xrightarrow{\overline{a}(x)} Q$ and Q has completed trace tr then P has completed trace $\Im x\,(ax\,;\,tr)$.
- If $P \xrightarrow{\overline{a}b} Q$ and Q has completed trace tr then P has completed trace $ab\,;\,tr$.
- If $P \xrightarrow{\tau} Q$ and Q has completed trace tr then P has completed trace tr.

Observe that deadlocked processes have no completed trace. Contrast for example $\nu x.x(y) \mid \checkmark$ and $\nu x.x(y) + \checkmark$, where the former has no completed trace but the later has completed trace I.

Interestingly, *equivariance* is a design decision in the sense that cut elimination is still provable for a system without *equivariance*. However, *equivariance* is a requirement for modelling private names in process calculi. Consider π-calculus process $\nu y.\nu x.\left(\overline{ax}.\overline{by}\right)$ and the completed trace that outputs a fresh name on channel a then a separate fresh name on channel b. In the above encoding $\vdash \mathit{И}y.\mathit{И}x.\left(\overline{ax}\,;\,\overline{by}\right) \parr \Im x.\,(ax\,;\,\Im y.ay)$ is provable only with *equivariance*. Hence *equivariance* is necessary for the following proposition, that is a consequence of Theorem 4.

► **Proposition 6.** *If a process P has completed trace tr then $\vdash [\![P]\!]_\pi \parr tr$.*

Proof. Firstly, proceed by induction over the structure of the derivation of a labelled transition.

The base cases follows since $[\![a(x).P]\!]_\pi \parr \forall y\left(\overline{ay}\,;\,\overline{[\![P\{^y/_x\}]\!]_\pi}\right) \equiv \exists x\,(ax\,;\,[\![P]\!]_\pi) \parr \forall x\left(\overline{ax}\,;\,\overline{[\![P]\!]_\pi}\right)$, where $y \# \exists x\,(ax\,;\,[\![P]\!]_\pi)$ by α-conversion, which is provable by Prop. 3. Similarly $\vdash [\![\overline{a}b.P]\!]_\pi \parr \left(ab\,;\,\overline{[\![P]\!]_\pi}\right)$ by Prop. 3.

By induction assume that $\vdash [\![P]\!]_\pi \parr \forall x\left(\overline{ax}\,;\,\overline{[\![P']\!]_\pi}\right)$ and $\vdash [\![Q]\!]_\pi \parr \Im x\left(ax\,;\,\overline{[\![Q']\!]_\pi}\right)$ hold. Furthermore $\vdash \left([\![P]\!]_\pi \parr \forall x\left(\overline{ax}\,;\,\overline{[\![P']\!]_\pi}\right)\right) \otimes \left([\![Q]\!]_\pi \parr \Im x\left(ax\,;\,\overline{[\![Q']\!]_\pi}\right)\right) \multimap [\![P]\!]_\pi \parr [\![Q]\!]_\pi \parr \Im x\left(\overline{[\![P']\!]_\pi} \otimes \overline{[\![Q']\!]_\pi}\right)$ is provable as follows, using Proposition 3.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\overline{[\![P]\!]_\pi} \parr \exists x\,(ax\,;\,[\![P']\!]_\pi)\right) \parr \left(\overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi} \otimes \mathit{\forall} x\,(\overline{ax}\,;\,[\![Q']\!]_\pi)\right) \parr [\![P]\!]_\pi \parr [\![Q]\!]_\pi \parr \Im x\left(\overline{[\![P']\!]_\pi} \otimes \overline{[\![Q']\!]_\pi}\right)\\
&\longrightarrow \left(\left(\overline{[\![P]\!]_\pi} \parr [\![P]\!]_\pi\right) \otimes \exists x\,(ax\,;\,[\![P']\!]_\pi)\right) \parr \left(\left(\overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi} \parr [\![Q]\!]_\pi\right) \otimes \mathit{\forall} x\,(\overline{ax}\,;\,[\![Q']\!]_\pi)\right) \parr \Im x\left(\overline{[\![P']\!]_\pi} \otimes \overline{[\![Q']\!]_\pi}\right)\\
&\longrightarrow \exists x\,(ax\,;\,[\![P']\!]_\pi) \parr \mathit{\forall} x\,(\overline{ax}\,;\,[\![Q']\!]_\pi) \parr \Im x\left(\overline{[\![P']\!]_\pi} \otimes \overline{[\![Q']\!]_\pi}\right)\\
&\longrightarrow \mathit{\forall} x\left(\exists x\,(ax\,;\,[\![P']\!]_\pi) \parr (\overline{ax}\,;\,[\![Q']\!]_\pi) \parr \left(\overline{[\![P']\!]_\pi} \otimes \overline{[\![Q']\!]_\pi}\right)\right)\\
&\longrightarrow \mathit{\forall} x\left((ax\,;\,[\![P']\!]_\pi) \parr (\overline{ax}\,;\,[\![Q']\!]_\pi) \parr \left(\overline{[\![P']\!]_\pi} \otimes \overline{[\![Q']\!]_\pi}\right)\right)\\
&\longrightarrow \mathit{\forall} x\left((ax \parr \overline{ax})\,;\,\left([\![P']\!]_\pi \parr [\![Q']\!]_\pi \parr \left(\overline{[\![P']\!]_\pi} \otimes \overline{[\![Q']\!]_\pi}\right)\right)\right)\\
&\longrightarrow \mathit{\forall} x\left((ax \parr \overline{ax})\,;\,\left(\left([\![P']\!]_\pi \parr \overline{[\![P']\!]_\pi}\right) \otimes \left([\![Q']\!]_\pi \parr \overline{[\![Q']\!]_\pi}\right)\right)\right) \longrightarrow \mathit{\forall} x\mathrm{I} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence by Theorem 4, $\vdash [\![P \mid Q]\!]_\pi \parr \overline{[\![\nu x\,(P' \mid Q')]\!]_\pi}$.

By induction assume that $\vdash [\![P]\!]_\pi \parr \forall x\left(\overline{ax}\,;\,\overline{[\![P']\!]_\pi}\right)$ and $\vdash [\![Q]\!]_\pi \parr \left(ab\,;\,\overline{[\![Q']\!]_\pi}\right)$ hold. Furthermore, $\vdash \left([\![P]\!]_\pi \parr \forall x\left(\overline{ax}\,;\,\overline{[\![P']\!]_\pi}\right)\right) \otimes \left([\![Q]\!]_\pi \parr \left(ab\,;\,\overline{[\![Q']\!]_\pi}\right)\right) \multimap [\![P]\!]_\pi \parr [\![Q]\!]_\pi \parr \left(\overline{[\![P']\!]_\pi\{{}^{b}/_{x}\}} \otimes \overline{[\![Q']\!]_\pi}\right)$ is provable as follows, using Proposition 3 and Lemma **??**.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\overline{[\![P]\!]_\pi} \otimes \exists x\,(ax\,;\,[\![P']\!]_\pi)\right) \parr \left(\overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi} \otimes \left(\overline{ab}\,;\,[\![Q']\!]_\pi\right)\right) \parr [\![P]\!]_\pi \parr [\![Q]\!]_\pi \parr \left(\overline{[\![P']\!]_\pi\{{}^{b}/_{x}\}} \otimes \overline{[\![Q']\!]_\pi}\right)\\
&\longrightarrow \left(\left(\overline{[\![P]\!]_\pi} \parr [\![P]\!]_\pi\right) \otimes \exists x\,(ax\,;\,[\![P']\!]_\pi)\right) \parr \left(\left(\overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi} \parr [\![Q]\!]_\pi\right) \otimes \left(\overline{ab}\,;\,[\![Q']\!]_\pi\right)\right) \parr \left(\overline{[\![P']\!]_\pi\{{}^{b}/_{x}\}} \otimes \overline{[\![Q']\!]_\pi}\right)\\
&\longrightarrow \exists x\,(ax\,;\,[\![P']\!]_\pi) \parr \left(\overline{ab}\,;\,[\![Q']\!]_\pi\right) \parr \left(\overline{[\![P']\!]_\pi\{{}^{b}/_{x}\}} \otimes \overline{[\![Q']\!]_\pi}\right)\\
&\longrightarrow \left(ab\,;\,\left[\!\left[P'\left\{{}^{b}/_{x}\right\}\right]\!\right]_\pi\right) \parr \left(\overline{ab}\,;\,[\![Q']\!]_\pi\right) \parr \left(\overline{[\![P']\!]_\pi\{{}^{b}/_{x}\}} \otimes \overline{[\![Q']\!]_\pi}\right)\\
&\longrightarrow \left(ab \parr \overline{ab}\right)\,;\,\left([\![Q']\!]_\pi \parr \left[\!\left[P'\left\{{}^{b}/_{x}\right\}\right]\!\right]_\pi \parr \left(\overline{[\![P']\!]_\pi\{{}^{b}/_{x}\}} \otimes \overline{[\![Q']\!]_\pi}\right)\right) \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence by Theorem 4, $\vdash [\![P \mid Q]\!]_\pi \parr \overline{[\![P'\{{}^{b}/_{x}\} \mid Q']\!]_\pi}$.

By induction assume that $\vdash [\![P]\!]_\pi \parr \left(ab\,;\,\overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right)$. Furthermore, $\vdash [\![P]\!]_\pi \parr \left(ab\,;\,\overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right) \multimap [\![P]\!]_\pi \parr [\![R]\!]_\pi \parr \left(ab\,;\,\left(\overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi} \otimes \overline{[\![R]\!]_\pi}\right)\right)$ is provable as follows using Proposition 3.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\overline{[\![P]\!]_\pi} \otimes \left(\overline{ab}\,;\,[\![Q]\!]_\pi\right)\right) \parr [\![P]\!]_\pi \parr [\![R]\!]_\pi \parr \left(ab\,;\,\left(\overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi} \otimes \overline{[\![R]\!]_\pi}\right)\right)\\
&\qquad\longrightarrow \left(\left(\overline{[\![P]\!]_\pi} \parr [\![P]\!]_\pi\right) \otimes \left(\overline{ab} \otimes [\![Q]\!]_\pi\right)\right) \parr [\![R]\!]_\pi \parr \left(ab\,;\,\left(\overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi} \otimes \overline{[\![R]\!]_\pi}\right)\right)\\
&\qquad\longrightarrow \left(\overline{ab} \parr ab\right)\,;\,\left([\![Q]\!]_\pi \parr [\![R]\!]_\pi \parr \left(\overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi} \otimes \overline{[\![R]\!]_\pi}\right)\right)\\
&\qquad\longrightarrow \left(\overline{ab} \parr ab\right)\,;\,\left(\left(\left([\![Q]\!]_\pi \parr \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right) \otimes \left([\![R]\!]_\pi \parr \overline{[\![R]\!]_\pi}\right)\right)\right) \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Theorem 4, $\vdash [\![P \mid R]\!]_\pi \parr \left(ab\,;\,\overline{[\![Q \mid R]\!]_\pi}\right)$.

By induction assume that $\vdash [\![P]\!]_\pi \parr \forall x\left(\overline{ax}\,;\,\overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right)$, where $x \mathbin{\#} R$. Observe that $\vdash [\![P]\!]_\pi \parr \forall x\left(\overline{ax}\,;\,\overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right) \multimap [\![P]\!]_\pi \parr [\![R]\!]_\pi \parr \forall x\left(\overline{ax}\,;\,\left(\overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi} \otimes \overline{[\![R]\!]_\pi}\right)\right)$ is provable as follows by Proposition 3, since $x \mathbin{\#} R$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\overline{[\![P]\!]_\pi} \otimes \exists x\,(ax\,;\,[\![Q]\!]_\pi)\right) \parr [\![P]\!]_\pi \parr [\![R]\!]_\pi \parr \forall x\left(\overline{ax}\,;\,\left(\overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi} \otimes \overline{[\![R]\!]_\pi}\right)\right)\\
&\qquad\longrightarrow \left(\left(\overline{[\![P]\!]_\pi} \parr [\![P]\!]_\pi\right) \otimes \exists x\,(ax\,;\,[\![Q]\!]_\pi)\right) \parr [\![R]\!]_\pi \parr \forall x\left(\overline{ax}\,;\,\left(\overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi} \otimes \overline{[\![R]\!]_\pi}\right)\right)\\
&\qquad\longrightarrow \exists x\,(ax\,;\,[\![Q]\!]_\pi) \parr [\![R]\!]_\pi \parr \forall x\left(\overline{ax}\,;\,\left(\overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi} \otimes \overline{[\![R]\!]_\pi}\right)\right)\\
&\qquad\longrightarrow \forall x\left(\exists x\,(ax\,;\,[\![Q]\!]_\pi) \parr [\![R]\!]_\pi \parr \left(\overline{ax}\,;\,\left(\overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi} \otimes \overline{[\![R]\!]_\pi}\right)\right)\right)\\
&\qquad\longrightarrow \forall x\left((ax\,;\,[\![Q]\!]_\pi) \parr [\![R]\!]_\pi \parr \left(\overline{ax}\,;\,\left(\overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi} \otimes \overline{[\![R]\!]_\pi}\right)\right)\right)\\
&\qquad\longrightarrow \forall x\left((ax\,;\,\overline{ax})\,;\,\left([\![Q]\!]_\pi \parr [\![R]\!]_\pi \parr \left(\overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi} \otimes \overline{[\![R]\!]_\pi}\right)\right)\right)\\
&\qquad\longrightarrow \forall x\left((ax\,;\,\overline{ax})\,;\,\left(\left([\![Q]\!]_\pi \parr \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right) \otimes \left([\![R]\!]_\pi \parr \overline{[\![R]\!]_\pi}\right)\right)\right) \longrightarrow \forall x\mathrm{I} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Theorem 4, $\vdash [\![P \mid R]\!]_\pi \parr \forall x\left(\overline{ax}\,;\,\overline{[\![Q \mid R]\!]_\pi}\right)$.

By induction assume that $\vdash [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \Im x\left(ax \,;\, \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right)$, where $x \# R$. Thereby, using Proposition 3, the following proof can be constructed

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
[\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel [\![R]\!]_\pi \parallel \Im x\left(\left(ax \,;\, \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right) \otimes \overline{[\![R]\!]_\pi}\right) & \longrightarrow & [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \Im x\left([\![R]\!]_\pi \parallel \left(\left(ax \,;\, \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right) \otimes \overline{[\![R]\!]_\pi}\right)\right) \\
& \longrightarrow & [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \Im x\left(\left(\left(ax \,;\, \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right) \otimes \left([\![R]\!]_\pi \parallel \overline{[\![R]\!]_\pi}\right)\right)\right) \\
& \longrightarrow & [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \Im x\left(ax \,;\, \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right) \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}
\end{array}$$

By induction assume that $\vdash [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \forall x\left(\overline{ax} \parallel \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right)$ holds. Now $[\![P]\!]_\pi \oplus [\![Q]\!]_\pi \parallel \forall x\left(\overline{ax} \parallel \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right) \longrightarrow [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \forall x\left(\overline{ax} \parallel \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right) \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$. Other cases for choice follow the same pattern.

By induction assume that $\vdash [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \forall x\left(\overline{ax} \parallel \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right)$ holds, where y is such that $x \neq y$ and $a \neq y$. Thereby the following proof can be constructed as required.

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
[\![\nu y.P]\!]_\pi \parallel \forall x\left(\overline{ax} \parallel \overline{[\![\nu x.Q]\!]_\pi}\right) = & \mathit{И}y\, [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \forall x\left(\overline{ax} \parallel \Im y \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right) \\
\longrightarrow & \mathit{И}y\, [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \forall x \Im y\left(\overline{ax} \parallel \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right) \\
\longrightarrow & \mathit{И}y\, [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \Im y \forall x\left(\overline{ax} \parallel \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right) \\
\longrightarrow & \mathit{И}y\left([\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \forall x\left(\overline{ax} \parallel \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right)\right) \longrightarrow \mathit{И}y\mathrm{I} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}
\end{array}$$

By induction assume that $\vdash [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \Im x\left(ax \parallel \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right)$ holds, where y is such that $x \neq y$ and $a \neq y$. Thereby the following proof can be constructed as required.

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
[\![\nu y.P]\!]_\pi \parallel \Im x\left(ax \parallel \overline{[\![\nu x.Q]\!]_\pi}\right) = & \mathit{И}y\, [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \Im x\left(ax \parallel \Im y \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right) \\
\longrightarrow & \mathit{И}y\, [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \Im x \Im y\left(ax \parallel \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right) \\
\equiv & \mathit{И}y\, [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \Im y \Im x\left(ax \parallel \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right) \\
\longrightarrow & \mathit{И}y\left([\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \Im x\left(ax \parallel \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right)\right) \longrightarrow \mathit{И}y\mathrm{I} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}
\end{array}$$

Note that the above case uses equivariance.

By induction assume that $\vdash [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \left(ab \parallel \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right)$ holds, where y is such that $b \neq y$ and $a \neq y$. Thereby the following proof can be constructed as required.

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
[\![\nu y.P]\!]_\pi \parallel \left(ab \parallel \overline{[\![\nu x.Q]\!]_\pi}\right) = & \mathit{И}y\, [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \left(ab \parallel \Im y \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right) \\
\longrightarrow & \mathit{И}y\, [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \Im y\left(ab \parallel \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right) \\
\longrightarrow & \mathit{И}y\left([\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \left(ab \parallel \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right)\right) \longrightarrow \mathit{И}y\mathrm{I} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}
\end{array}$$

By induction assume that $\vdash [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \left(ax \parallel \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right)$ holds, such that $a \neq x$. Thereby the following proof can be constructed as required.

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
[\![\nu x.P]\!]_\pi \parallel \Im x\left(ax \parallel \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right) = & \mathit{И}x\, [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \Im x\left(ax \parallel \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right) \\
\longrightarrow & \mathit{И}x\left([\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \left(ax \parallel \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right)\right) \longrightarrow \mathit{И}x\mathrm{I} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}
\end{array}$$

This completes the case analysis on the structure of the derivation of a transition. Hence, by induction, any one step transition corresponds to one of the following proofs.

$$\vdash [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \forall x\left(\overline{ax} \,;\, \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right) \quad \vdash [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \Im x\left(ax \,;\, \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right) \quad \vdash [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \left(ab \,;\, \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}\right) \quad \vdash [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \overline{[\![Q]\!]_\pi}$$

Now assume also that $\vdash Q \parallel tr$ holds for some completed trace tr. In each of the four respective cases above we can construct a proof as follows, by Theorem 4, as required.

$$\vdash [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \forall x\,(\overline{ax} \,;\, tr) \qquad \vdash [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel \Im x\,(ax \,;\, tr) \qquad \vdash [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel (ab \,;\, tr) \qquad \vdash [\![P]\!]_\pi \parallel tr$$

Hence the proposition follows by induction on the derivation of a trace, where the base case follows since a predicate formed using only the unit, *par* and *new* is always provable, by induction on the structure of such a predicate. □

Note the above proposition holds for finite processes in both the π-calculus [35] and πI-calculus [41]. Further developments building on results for completed traces in BV [9] is left to future work.

Observe that no bisimulation can be complete with respect to logical equivalence. As with *mutual simulation* [49], logical equivalence is checked by a preorder in each direction. For example, both mutual simulation and logical equivalence identify processes corresponding to $(a \,;\, (b \oplus c)) \oplus (a \,;\, b)$ and $a \,;\, (b \oplus c)$; whereas any bisimulation distinguishes these processes.

A desirable property of linear implication is that *autoconcurrency* is avoided, since $a \parallel a \multimap a \,;\, a$ does **not** hold. Avoiding autoconcurrency is an indicator that logical implication fully respects the causal order of events [4, 51]; and furthermore permits action refinement [1]. Observe also that, since $(a \,;\, b) \oplus (a \,;\, b) \multimap a \,;\, (b \oplus c)$ does **not** hold, no interleaving equivalence is sound with respect to logical equivalence. However, the so called *absorption law* $(b \parallel (a \oplus c)) \oplus (a \parallel b) \oplus ((b \oplus c) \parallel a) \multimap (b \parallel (a \oplus c)) \oplus ((b \oplus c) \parallel a)$ is provable; as respected by complete history preserving bisimulation for example [4, 51, 50]. Thus any behavioural equivalences sound with respect to logical equivalence must be branching-time equivalences fully respecting causality. Such questions formally relating observational preorders and implication rely on cut elimination for MAV1, leading to the main cut elimination result of this paper.

3.3 Preliminary Lemmas and Killing Contexts

We extend a trick employed for MAV [23] to MAV1 where *with* and universal quantification receive a more direct treatment than other operators. The proof for *with* has a knock on effect for the nominal quantifiers requiring some vacuous *new* and *wen* quantifiers to be removed; while the proof for universal quantification requires closure of rules under substitution of terms for variables. This leads to the following five lemmas, established directly by functions over predicates.

▶ **Lemma 7** (Substitution). *If $P \longrightarrow Q$ holds then $P\{^v/_x\} \longrightarrow Q\{^v/_x\}$ holds.*

Proof. Consider the case of the *switch* rule. The following rule can be derived.

$$((P \otimes Q) \parallel V)\{^v/_x\} \equiv (P\{^v/_x\} \otimes Q\{^v/_x\}) \parallel V\{^v/_x\} \longrightarrow P\{^v/_x\} \otimes (Q\{^v/_x\} \parallel V\{^v/_x\}) \equiv (P \otimes (Q \parallel V))\{^v/_x\}$$

The cases are similar for the rules *sequence*, *left choice*, *right choice*, *external*, *atomic interaction*, *tidy*, *tidy1* and *tidy new*.

Consider the case of the *extrude new* rule. The following rule can be derived, where $y \# Q$, $z \neq x$, $z \# v$ and $x \# (\mathit{\Nu} y P \parallel Q)$.

$$\begin{array}{rl} (\mathit{\Nu} y P \parallel Q)\{^v/_x\} \equiv & \mathit{\Nu} z \left(P\left\{^z/_y\right\}\{^v/_x\}\right) \parallel Q \\ \longrightarrow & \mathit{\Nu} z \left(P\left\{^z/_y\right\}\{^v/_x\} \parallel Q\right) \equiv \mathit{\Nu} z \left((P \parallel Q)\left\{^z/_y\right\}\{^v/_x\}\right) \equiv \mathit{\Nu} y\,((P \parallel Q))\{^v/_x\} \end{array}$$

The cases for *extrude1*, *left wen*, and *right wen* rules are similar.

In the case of the *select* rule. The following rule can be derived, where $z \neq x$, $z \# v$ and $x \# (\exists y P)$.

$$(\exists y P)\{^v/_x\} \equiv \left(\exists z P\left\{^z/_y\right\}\{^v/_x\}\right) \longrightarrow P\left\{^z/_y\right\}\{^v/_x\}\left\{^{t\{^v/_x\}}/_z\right\} \equiv P\left\{^z/_y\right\}\{^t/_z\}\{^v/_x\} \equiv P\left\{^t/_y\right\}\{^v/_x\}$$

Consider the case of the *close* rule. The following rule can be derived, where $z \neq x$, $z \# v$ and $x \# (\mathit{\Im} y P \parallel \mathit{\Nu} y Q)$.

$$\begin{array}{rl} (\mathit{\Im} y P \parallel \mathit{\Nu} y Q)\{^v/_x\} \equiv & \mathit{\Im} z \left(P\left\{^z/_y\right\}\{^v/_x\}\right) \parallel \mathit{\Nu} z \left(Q\left\{^z/_y\right\}\{^v/_x\}\right) \\ \longrightarrow & \mathit{\Nu} z \left(P\left\{^z/_y\right\}\{^v/_x\} \parallel Q\left\{^z/_y\right\}\{^v/_x\}\right) \equiv \mathit{\Nu} z \left((P \parallel Q)\left\{^z/_y\right\}\{^v/_x\}\right) \equiv (\mathit{\Nu} y\,(P \parallel Q))\{^v/_x\} \end{array}$$

The cases for *medial1*, *medial new*, *medial wen* are similar.

Consider the case of the *new wen* rule. Pick fresh names y' and z' such that $x \neq y'$, $x \neq z'$, $y' \neq z'$, $y' \# v$, $z' \# v$, $y' \# P$, $z' \# P$ and $y' \neq z'$, hence $\{^{y'}/_{y}\}\{^{z'}/_{z}\} = \{^{z'}/_{z}\}\{^{y'}/_{y}\}$; and thereby the following rule can be construced.

$$(\text{И}y\text{Э}zP)\{^{v}/_{x}\} \equiv \text{И}y'\text{Э}z'\left(P\{^{z'}/_{z}\}\{^{y'}/_{y}\}\{^{v}/_{x}\}\right) \longrightarrow \text{Э}z'\text{И}y'\left(P\{^{y'}/_{y}\}\{^{z'}/_{z}\}\{^{v}/_{x}\}\right) \equiv (\text{Э}z\text{И}yP)\{^{v}/_{x}\}$$

The lemma follows by induction on the length of a derivation. □

► **Lemma 8** (Vacuous new). *If* $\vdash C\{\ \text{И}xP\ \}$ *holds and* $x \# P$ *then* $\vdash C\{\ P\ \}$ *holds.*

Proof. Define a function $n(\ \cdot\ )$ over predicates with an extra bold new quantifier **И** such that $n(\mathbf{И}xP) = P$ where $x \# P$, $n(\text{Ծ}xP) = \text{Ծ}xn(P)$, $n(P \odot Q) = n(P) \odot n(Q)$, $n(\kappa) = \kappa$, where $\text{Ծ} \in \{\text{И}, \text{Э}, \forall, \exists\}$, $\odot \in \{\oplus, \&, \|, ;, \otimes\}$ and $\kappa \in \{\text{I}, \alpha, \overline{\alpha}\}$. Proceed by induction on the length of the proof to establish the stronger lemma: if $\vdash P$ then $\vdash n(P)$. The base case when $P = n(P)$ is immediate.

Consider the case where the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $C\{\ \mathbf{И}xP \parallel \text{Э}xQ\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \text{И}x\,(P \parallel Q)\ \}$, where $x \# P$. By induction $\vdash n(C\{\ \text{И}x\,(P \parallel Q)\ \})$, and also $n(C\{\ \mathbf{И}xP \parallel \text{Э}xQ\ \}) = n(C\{\ P \parallel \text{Э}xQ\ \}) \longrightarrow n(C\{\ \text{Э}x\,(P \parallel Q)\ \}) \longrightarrow n(C\{\ \text{И}x\,(P \parallel Q)\ \})$. Hence $\vdash n(C\{\ \mathbf{И}xP \parallel \text{Э}xQ\ \})$ as required.

Consider the case where the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $C\{\ \mathbf{И}xP \parallel Q\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \mathbf{И}x\,(P \parallel Q)\ \}$, where $x \# P$ and $x \# Q$. By induction $\vdash n(C\{\ \text{И}x\,(P \parallel Q)\ \})$, and also $n(C\{\ \mathbf{И}xP \parallel Q\ \}) = n(C\{\ P \parallel Q\ \}) = n(C\{\ \mathbf{И}x\,(P \parallel Q)\ \})$. Hence $\vdash n(C\{\ \mathbf{И}xP \parallel Q\ \})$ as required.

Consider the case where the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $C\{\ \mathbf{И}^{\text{I}}\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \text{I}\ \}$. By induction $\vdash n(C\{\ \text{И}x^{\text{I}}\ \})$, and also $n(C\{\ \mathbf{И}x^{\text{I}}\ \}) = n(C\{\ \text{I}\ \})$. Hence $\vdash n(C\{\ \mathbf{И}x^{\text{I}}\ \})$ as required.

Consider the case where the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $C\{\ \mathbf{И}x\,(P\ ;\ Q)\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \mathbf{И}xP\ ;\ \mathbf{И}xQ\ \}$, where $x \# P$ and $x \# Q$. By induction $\vdash n(C\{\ \mathbf{И}xP\ ;\ \mathbf{И}xQ\ \})$, and also $n(C\{\ \mathbf{И}xP\ ;\ \mathbf{И}xQ\ \}) = n(C\{\ P\ ;\ Q\ \}) = n(C\{\ \mathbf{И}x\,(P\ ;\ Q)\ \})$. Hence $\vdash n(C\{\ \mathbf{И}x\,(P\ ;\ Q)\ \})$ as required.

Consider the case where the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $C\{\ \mathbf{И}x\text{Э}yP\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \text{Э}y\mathbf{И}xP\ \}$, where $x \# P$. By induction $\vdash n(C\{\ \text{Э}y\mathbf{И}xP\ \})$, and also $n(C\{\ \text{Э}y\mathbf{И}xP\ \}) = n(C\{\ \text{Э}yP\ \}) = n(C\{\ \mathbf{И}x\text{Э}yP\ \})$. Hence $\vdash n(C\{\ \mathbf{И}x\text{Э}yP\ \})$ as required.

All other cases follow immediately by applying the induction hypothesis. Thereby the stronger lemma is established.

The lemma now follows by considering $\vdash C\{\ \mathbf{И}xP\ \}$, where no bold new quantifier appears in the context and $x \# P$. Since $n(C\{\ \mathbf{И}xP\ \}) = C\{\ P\ \}$ we have also $\vdash C\{\ P\ \}$ as required. □

► **Lemma 9** (Vacuous wen). *If* $\vdash C\{\ \text{Э}xP\ \}$ *holds and* $x \# P$ *then* $\vdash C\{\ P\ \}$ *holds.*

Proof. Define a function $w(\ \cdot\ )$ over predicates with an extra bold wen quantifier **Э** such that $w(\mathbf{Э}xP) = P$ where $x \# P$, $w(\text{Ծ}xP) = \text{Ծ}xw(P)$, $w(P \odot Q) = w(P) \odot w(Q)$, $w(\kappa) = \kappa$, where $\text{Ծ} \in \{\text{И}, \text{Э}, \forall, \exists\}$, $\odot \in \{\oplus, \&, \|, ;, \otimes\}$ and $\kappa \in \{\text{I}, \alpha, \overline{\alpha}\}$. Proceed by induction on the length of the proof to establish the stronger lemma: if $\vdash P$ then $\vdash w(P)$. The base case when $P = w(P)$ is immediate.

Consider the case where the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $C\{\ \mathbf{Э}xP\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \text{И}xP\ \}$, where $x \# P$. By induction $\vdash w(C\{\ \text{И}xP\ \})$, hence by Lemma 8, $\vdash w(C\{\ P\ \})$. Furthermore, $w(C\{\ \mathbf{Э}xP\ \}) = w(C\{\ P\ \})$ hence $\vdash w(C\{\ \mathbf{Э}xP\ \})$ as required.

Consider the case where the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $C\{\ \text{Ծ}y\mathbf{Э}xP\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \mathbf{Э}x\text{Ծ}yP\ \}$, for $\text{Ծ} \in \{\text{И}, \forall\}$ where $x \# P$. By induction $\vdash w(C\{\ \mathbf{Э}x\text{Ծ}yP\ \})$ and also $w(C\{\ \mathbf{Э}x\text{Ծ}yP\ \}) = w(C\{\ \text{Ծ}yP\ \}) = w(C\{\ \text{Ծ}y\mathbf{Э}xP\ \})$ hence $\vdash w(C\{\ \text{Ծ}y\mathbf{Э}xP\ \})$ as required.

Consider the case where the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $C\{\ \text{И}xP \parallel \mathbf{Э}xQ\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \text{И}x\,(P \parallel Q)\ \}$, where $x \# Q$. By induction $\vdash w(C\{\ \text{И}x\,(P \parallel Q)\ \})$ and also $w(C\{\ \text{И}xP \parallel \mathbf{Э}xQ\ \}) = w(C\{\ \text{И}xP \parallel Q\ \}) \longrightarrow w(C\{\ \text{И}x\,(P \parallel Q)\ \}) = w(C\{\ \text{И}x\,(P \parallel Q)\ \})$. Hence $\vdash w(C\{\ \text{И}xP \parallel \mathbf{Э}xQ\ \})$ as required.

Consider the case where the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $C\{\ \Im x P \odot \mathbin{⅋} x Q\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \Im x (P \odot Q)\ \}$, for $\odot \in \{\|, ;, \&\}$ where $x \# Q$. By induction $\vdash w(C\{\ \Im x (P \odot Q)\ \})$ and also $w(C\{\ \Im x P \odot \mathbin{⅋} x Q\ \}) = w(C\{\ \Im x P \odot Q\ \}) \longrightarrow w(C\{\ \Im x (P \odot Q)\ \})$. Hence $\vdash w(C\{\ \Im x P \odot \mathbin{⅋} x Q\ \})$ as required. The case where the left wen operator in the conclusion is bold is symmetric.

Consider the case where the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $C\{\ P \odot \mathbin{⅋} x Q\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \mathbin{⅋} x (P \odot Q)\ \}$, for $\odot \in \{\|, ;, \&\}$ where $x \# P$ and $x \# Q$. By induction $\vdash w(C\{\ \mathbin{⅋} x (P \odot Q)\ \})$ and also $w(C\{\ P \odot \mathbin{⅋} x Q\ \}) = w(C\{\ P \odot Q\ \}) \longrightarrow w(C\{\ \mathbin{⅋} x (P \odot Q)\ \})$. Hence $\vdash w(C\{\ P \odot \mathbin{⅋} x Q\ \})$ as required. The case where the left wen operator in the conclusion is bold is symmetric. □

▶ **Lemma 10** (Branching). *If* $\vdash C\{\ P \mathbin{\&} Q\ \}$ *holds then both* $\vdash C\{\ P\ \}$ *and* $\vdash C\{\ Q\ \}$ *hold.*

Proof. The proof works by constructing two proofs such that the respective left and right formula of the with connective are removed. To do so, we remove deductive rules that either involve the with connective concerned, or appear inside the branch to be removed. We provide only the case where the left branch is selected, the other case is symmetric. The function $\ell(.)$ over predicates with a distinguished *bold with* operator **&** is required. Where ℓ is defined such that $\ell(P \mathbin{\&} Q) = P$, $\ell(P \odot Q) = \ell(P) \odot \ell(Q)$, $\ell(\mathcal{O} x P) = \mathcal{O} x \ell(P)$ and $\ell(\kappa) = \kappa$, where $\mathcal{O} \in \{И, \Im, \forall, \exists\}$, $\odot \in \{\oplus, \&, \|, ;, \otimes\}$ and $\kappa \in \{\mathrm{I}, \alpha, \overline{\alpha}\}$.

The induction hypothesis is that if $\vdash T$, then we can construct a proof for $\vdash \ell(T)$. The base case is when $\ell(T) = T$ (e.g. when $T = \mathrm{I}$), in which case we are done. The inductive cases are listed below.

Consider when the bottommost rule of a proof $C\{\ T \mathbin{\&} \mathcal{D}\{\ U\ \}\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ T \mathbin{\&} \mathcal{D}\{\ V\ \}\ \}$ involving a bold *with* such that $\vdash C\{\ T \mathbin{\&} \mathcal{D}\{\ V\ \}\ \}$. Hence, by the induction hypothesis, $\vdash \ell\,(C\{\ T \mathbin{\&} \mathcal{D}\{\ V\ \}\ \})$ holds. Furthermore, $\ell\,(C\{\ T \mathbin{\&} \mathcal{D}\{\ V\ \}\ \}) = \ell\,(C\{\ T \mathbin{\&} \mathcal{D}\{\ U\ \}\ \})$. Hence $\vdash \ell\,(C\{\ T \mathbin{\&} \mathcal{D}\{\ U\ \}\ \})$ holds, as required.

Consider when the bottommost rule of a proof $C\{\ (T \mathbin{\&} U) \| V\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ (T \| V) \mathbin{\&} (U \| V)\ \}$ involving a bold *with* such that $\vdash C\{\ (T \| V) \mathbin{\&} (U \| V)\ \}$. Hence $\vdash \ell\,(C\{\ (T \| V) \mathbin{\&} (U \| V)\ \})$ holds by the induction hypothesis. Furthermore, clearly $\ell\,(C\{\ (T \| V) \mathbin{\&} (U \| V)\ \}) = \ell\,(C\{\ (T \mathbin{\&} U) \| V\ \})$. Thereby $\vdash \ell\,(C\{\ (T \mathbin{\&} U) \| V\ \})$ holds, as required.

Consider when the bottommost rule of a proof $C\{\ (T\ ;\ U) \mathbin{\&} (V\ ;\ W)\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ (T \mathbin{\&} V)\ ;\ (U \mathbin{\&} W)\ \}$ involving a bold *with* operator such that $\vdash C\{\ (T \mathbin{\&} V)\ ;\ (U \mathbin{\&} W)\ \}$. By the induction hypothesis, $\vdash \ell\,(C\{\ (T \mathbin{\&} V)\ ;\ (U \mathbin{\&} W)\ \})$ holds. Furthermore, it is clear that $\ell\,(C\{\ (T \mathbin{\&} V)\ ;\ (U \mathbin{\&} W)\ \}) = \ell\,(C\{\ (T\ ;\ U) \mathbin{\&} (V\ ;\ W)\ \})$. Thereby $\vdash \ell\,(C\{\ (T\ ;\ U) \mathbin{\&} (V\ ;\ W)\ \})$ holds, as required.

Consider when the bottommost rule of a proof $C\{\ \Im x P \mathbin{\&} \Im x Q\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \Im x (P \mathbin{\&} Q)\ \}$ involving a bold *with* operator such that $\vdash C\{\ \Im x (P \mathbin{\&} Q)\ \}$. By the induction hypothesis, $\vdash \ell\,(C\{\ \Im x (P \mathbin{\&} Q)\ \})$ holds. Furthermore, it is clear that $\ell\,(C\{\ \Im x P\ \}) = \ell\,(C\{\ \Im x (P \mathbin{\&} Q)\ \})$. Thereby $\vdash \ell\,(C\{\ \Im x (P \mathbin{\&} Q)\ \})$ holds, as required.

Consider when the bottommost rule of a proof $C\{\ P \mathbin{\&} \Im x Q\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \Im x (P \mathbin{\&} Q)\ \}$ involving a bold *with* operator, where $x \# P$. Since $\vdash C\{\ \Im x (P \mathbin{\&} Q)\ \}$, by the induction hypothesis, $\vdash \ell\,(C\{\ \Im x (P \mathbin{\&} Q)\ \})$ holds and also $\ell\,(C\{\ \Im x (P \mathbin{\&} Q)\ \}) = \ell\,(C\{\ \Im x P\ \})$; hence $\vdash \ell\,(C\{\ \Im x P\ \})$ holds. Now, by Lemma 9, $\vdash \ell\,(C\{\ P\ \})$ holds, since $x \# P$; and $\ell\,(C\{\ P\ \}) = \ell\,(C\{\ P \mathbin{\&} \Im x Q\ \})$; thereby $\vdash \ell\,(C\{\ P \mathbin{\&} \Im x Q\ \})$ as required.

Consider when the bottommost rule of a proof $C\{\ И x P \mathbin{\&} И x Q\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ И x (P \mathbin{\&} Q)\ \}$ involving a bold *with* operator such that $\vdash C\{\ И x (P \mathbin{\&} Q)\ \}$. By the induction hypothesis, $\vdash \ell\,(C\{\ И x (P \mathbin{\&} Q)\ \})$ holds. Furthermore, it is clear that $\ell\,(C\{\ И x P\ \}) = \ell\,(C\{\ И x (P \mathbin{\&} Q)\ \})$. Thereby $\vdash \ell\,(C\{\ И x (P \mathbin{\&} Q)\ \})$ holds, as required.

Consider when the bottommost rule of a proof $C\{\ P \mathbin{\&} И x Q\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ И x (P \mathbin{\&} Q)\ \}$ involving a bold *with* operator, where $x \# P$. Since $\vdash C\{\ И x (P \mathbin{\&} Q)\ \}$, by the induction hypothesis, $\vdash$

$\ell\,(C\{\,\mathit{И}x\,(P \,\&\, Q)\,\})$ holds and also $\ell\,(C\{\,\mathit{И}x\,(P \,\&\, Q)\,\}) = \ell\,(C\{\,\mathit{И}xP\,\})$; hence $\vdash \ell\,(C\{\,\mathit{И}xP\,\})$ holds. Now, by Lemma 8, $\vdash \ell\,(C\{\,P\,\})$ holds, since $x \# P$; and $\ell\,(C\{\,P\,\}) = \ell\,(C\{\,P \,\&\, \mathit{И}xQ\,\})$; thereby $\vdash \ell\,(C\{\,P \,\&\, \mathit{И}xQ\,\})$ as required.

Consider the case where $C\{\,\mathrm{I} \,\&\, \mathrm{I}\,\} \longrightarrow C\{\,\mathrm{I}\,\}$, where $\vdash C\{\,\mathrm{I}\,\}$. By the induction hypothesis, $\vdash \ell\,(\vdash C\{\,\mathrm{I}\,\})$ holds. Furthermore $\ell\,(C\{\,\mathrm{I} \,\&\, \mathrm{I}\,\}) = \ell\,(C\{\,\mathrm{I}\,\})$; hence $\vdash \ell\,(C\{\,\mathrm{I} \,\&\, \mathrm{I}\,\})$ as required.

In all other cases, $C\{\,T\,\} \longrightarrow C\{\,U\,\}$, by any rule, such that $\vdash C\{\,T\,\}$ and also $\ell\,(C\{\,T\,\}) \not\equiv \ell\,(C\{\,U\,\})$. By induction, $\vdash \ell\,(C\{\,U\,\})$ holds. Therefore, by applying the same rule, we can obtain a proof of $\ell\,(U)$.

All cases are exhausted, thereby if $\vdash T$ holds then $\vdash \ell(T)$ for any length of proof. Whence, by assuming that $C\{\,T \,\&\, U\,\}$ holds, we can construct a proof of $\ell\,(C\{\,T \,\&\, U\,\}) = C\{\,T\,\}$. A symmetric argument using a right projection on the bold *with* operator constructs a proof of $C\{\,U\,\}$.

▶ **Lemma 11** (Universal). *If $\vdash C\{\,\forall xT\,\}$ holds then, for all terms v, $\vdash C\{\,T\{^{v}/_{x}\}\,\}$ holds.*

Proof. We require a function over predicates $s_v(T)$ that replaces a certain universal quantifier in T with a substitution for a value v. The universal quantifiers to be replaced are highlighted in bold $\mathbf{\forall}$. Note that during a proof the bold external choice may be duplicated by the *external* rule, hence there may be multiple bold occurrences in a formula. The function is defined as follows, where $\odot \in \{;, \parallel, \otimes, \oplus, \&\}$ is any binary connective, $\mathcal{O} \in \{\forall, \exists, \mathit{И}, \Im\}$ is any quantifier except bold universal quantification and $\kappa \in \{\alpha, \overline{\alpha}, \mathrm{I}\}$ is any constant or atom.

$$s_v(\,\mathbf{\forall}xT) = T\{^{v}/_{x}\} \qquad s_v(\mathcal{O}xT) = \mathcal{O}xs_v(T) \qquad s_v\,(T \odot U) = s_v(T) \odot s_v(U) \qquad s_v(\kappa) = \kappa$$

In what follows we use that $s_v\,(C\{\,U\,\}) = C'\{\,s_v\,(U)\,\}$, for some context $C\{\ \}$ and such that $C'\{\ \}$ is obtained from $C\{\ \}$ by applying the s_v function.

Firstly, observe that if $P \equiv Q$, then $s_v(P) \equiv s_v(Q)$. The only case to consider is when α-conversion is applied to a bold universal quantifier. In this case, $s_v\,(\,\mathbf{\forall}xP) = P\{^{v}/_{x}\} = P\{^{y}/_{x}\}\left\{^{v}/_{y}\right\} = s_v\,(\,\mathbf{\forall}yP\{^{y}/_{x}\})$, where $y \# \forall xP$. For the base case, $s_v(T) = T$, in which case trivially if $\vdash T$ then $\vdash s_v(T)$, for example where $T \equiv \mathrm{I}$.

Consider the case when the bottommost rule in a proof involves the bold universal quantifier, as follows, $C\{\ \mathbf{\forall}xT \parallel U\,\} \longrightarrow C\{\ \mathbf{\forall}x\,(T \parallel U)\,\}$, where $x \# U$ and $\vdash C\{\ \mathbf{\forall}x\,(T \parallel U)\,\}$.

By the induction hypothesis, $\vdash s_v\,(C\{\ \mathbf{\forall}x\,(T \parallel U)\,\})$ holds. Now the following equalities hold.

$$s_v\,(C\{\ \mathbf{\forall}x\,(T \parallel U)\,\}) = C'\{\,(T \parallel U)\{^{v}/_{x}\}\,\} = C'\{\,T\{^{v}/_{x}\} \parallel U\,\} = s_v\,(C\{\ \mathbf{\forall}xT \parallel U\,\})$$

Hence $\vdash s_v\,(C\{\ \mathbf{\forall}xT \parallel U\,\})$ holds as required.

Consider the case where the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $C\{\ \mathbf{\forall}x\mathrm{I}\,\} \longrightarrow C\{\,\mathrm{I}\,\}$, where $\vdash C\{\,\mathrm{I}\,\}$ holds. By the induction hypothesis, $\vdash s_v\,(C\{\,\mathrm{I}\,\})$ holds. Furthermore, $s_v\,(C\{\ \mathbf{\forall}x\mathrm{I}\,\}) = s_v\,(C\{\,\mathrm{I}\,\})$. Hence $\vdash s_v\,(C\{\ \mathbf{\forall}x\mathrm{I}\,\})$ holds, as required.

Consider the case where the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $C\{\ \mathbf{\forall}x\Im yP\,\} \longrightarrow C\{\,\Im y\ \mathbf{\forall}xP\,\}$, where $\vdash C\{\,\Im y\ \mathbf{\forall}xP\,\}$ holds. By the induction hypothesis, $\vdash s_v\,(C\{\,\Im y\ \mathbf{\forall}xP\,\})$ holds. Thereby the following derivation holds for some fress z such that $z \neq x$, $z \# v$ and $z \# \Im yP$.

$$\begin{aligned} s_v\,(C\{\ \mathbf{\forall}x\Im yP\,\}) \equiv C\{\,(\Im yP)\{^{v}/_{x}\}\,\} \equiv\ & C\left\{\,\Im z\left(P\left\{^{z}/_{y}\right\}\{^{v}/_{x}\}\right)\,\right\} \\ \equiv\ & C\left\{\,\Im z\left(P\left\{^{z}/_{y}\right\}\{^{v}/_{x}\}\right)\,\right\} \\ \equiv\ & s_v\left(C\left\{\,\Im z\ \mathbf{\forall}x\left(P\left\{^{z}/_{y}\right\}\right)\,\right\}\right) \equiv s_v\,(C\{\,\Im y\ \mathbf{\forall}xP\,\}) \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\vdash s_v\,(C\{\,\Im y\ \mathbf{\forall}xP\,\})$ holds, as required.

Consider the case where the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $C\{\ \mathbf{\forall} x \mathbin{⅋} y P\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \mathbin{⅋} y\ \mathbf{\forall} x P\ \}$, where $\vdash C\{\ \mathbin{⅋} y\ \mathbf{\forall} x P\ \}$ holds. By the induction hypothesis, $\vdash s_v\,(C\{\ \mathbin{⅋} y\ \mathbf{\forall} x P\ \})$ holds. Thereby the following derivation holds for some fress z such that $z \neq x$, $z \# v$ and $z \# \mathbin{⅋} y P$.

$$\begin{aligned} s_v\,(C\{\ \mathbf{\forall} x \mathbin{⅋} y P\ \}) \equiv C\{\ (\mathbin{⅋} y P)\{{}^{v}/_{x}\}\ \} \equiv\ & C\Big\{\ \mathbin{⅋} z \Big(P\Big\{{}^{z}/_{y}\Big\}\{{}^{v}/_{x}\}\Big)\ \Big\} \\ \equiv\ & C\Big\{\ \mathbin{⅋} z \Big(P\Big\{{}^{z}/_{y}\Big\}\{{}^{v}/_{x}\}\Big)\ \Big\} \\ \equiv\ & s_v\Big(C\Big\{\ \mathbin{⅋} z\ \mathbf{\forall} x \Big(P\Big\{{}^{z}/_{y}\Big\}\Big)\ \Big\}\Big) \equiv s_v\,(C\{\ \mathbin{⅋} y\ \mathbf{\forall} x P\ \}) \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\vdash s_v\,(C\{\ \mathbin{⅋} y\ \mathbf{\forall} x P\ \})$ holds, as required.

Consider when a rule appears within the scope of a bold universal quantifier, of the form $C\{\ \mathbf{\forall} x \mathcal{D}\{\ T\ \}\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \mathbf{\forall} x \mathcal{D}\{\ U\ \}\ \}$, where $\vdash C\{\ \mathbf{\forall} x \mathcal{D}\{\ U\ \}\ \}$ holds. By the induction hypothesis, $\vdash s_v\,(C\{\ \mathbf{\forall} x \mathcal{D}\{\ U\ \}\ \})$ holds. Now both of the following equivalences hold: $s_v\,(C\{\ \mathbf{\forall} x \mathcal{D}\{\ U\ \}\ \}) \equiv C'\{\ \mathcal{D}\{\ U\ \}\{{}^{v}/_{x}\}\ \}$ and $s_v\,(C\{\ \mathbf{\forall} x \mathcal{D}\{\ T\ \}\ \}) \equiv C'\{\ \mathcal{D}\{\ T\ \}\{{}^{v}/_{x}\}\ \}$. Hence, by Lemma 7, $\vdash s_v\,(C\{\ \mathbf{\forall} x \mathcal{D}\{\ T\ \}\ \})$ holds as required.

Otherwise, the bottommost rule does not directly involve a bold universal quantifier nor is it applied inside the scope of a bold universal quantifier. In this case, the bottommost rule is of the form $C\{\ T\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ U\ \}$, where $\vdash C\{\ U\ \}$ holds. By the induction hypothesis, $\vdash s_v\,(C\{\ U\ \})$ holds. Now $s_v\,(C\{\ U\ \}) = C'\{\ s_v\,(U)\ \}$ for some context and $s_v\,(C\{\ T\ \}) = C'\{\ s_v\,(T)\ \}$ for the same context. By Lemma 7, since $T \longrightarrow U$, $s_v\,(T) \longrightarrow s_v\,(U)$; hence $C'\{\ s_v\,(T)\ \} \longrightarrow C'\{\ s_v\,(U)\ \}$. Thereby $\vdash s_v\,(C\{\ T\ \})$ holds, as required.

Now by induction on the length of a proof, if $\vdash T$ holds then $\vdash s_v\,(T)$ holds. So, as a special case, if $\vdash C\{\ \mathbf{\forall} x T\ \}$, where not further bold universal quantifiers occur in the context, then $\vdash C\{\ T\{{}^{v}/_{x}\}\ \}$ holds. □

We require a restricted form of context called a killing context (terminology is from [13]). A killing context is a context with one or more holes, defined as follows.

▶ **Definition 12.** A killing context is a context defined by the following grammar.

$$\mathcal{T}\{\ \} ::= \{\ \cdot\ \} \mid \mathcal{T}\{\ \}\ \&\ \mathcal{T}\{\ \} \mid \forall x \mathcal{T}\{\ \} \mid \mathbin{⅋} x \mathcal{T}\{\ \}$$

In the above, $\{\ \cdot\ \}$ is a hole into which any predicate can be plugged. An n-ary killing context is a killing context in which n holes appear.

A killing context represents a context that cannot in general be removed until all other rules in a proof have been applied, hence the corresponding *tidy* rules are suspended until the end of a proof. A killing context has properties that are applied frequently in proofs, characterised by the following lemmas.

▶ **Lemma 13.** *For any killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$, $\vdash \mathcal{T}\{\ \mathrm{I}, \ldots, \mathrm{I}\ \}$ holds, and assuming the variables of $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ and the free variables of P are disjoint $P \parr \mathcal{T}\{\ Q_1, Q_2, \ldots Q_n\ \} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ P \parr Q_1, P \parr Q_2, \ldots P \parr Q_n\ \}$.*

Proof. The proofs follow by straightforward inductions over the structure of a killing context.

When the killing context is one hole only $P \parr \{\ Q\ \} = \{\ P \parr Q\ \}$ and $\{\ \mathrm{I}\ \} = \mathrm{I}$, as required.

Now assume that by the induction hypothesis the following hold for killing contexts $\mathcal{T}^1\{\ \}$ and $\mathcal{T}^2\{\ \}$, and also $\vdash \mathcal{T}^1\{\ \mathrm{I}, \ldots, \mathrm{I}\ \}$ and $\vdash \mathcal{T}^2\{\ \mathrm{I}, \ldots, \mathrm{I}\ \}$.

$$\begin{aligned} P \parr \mathcal{T}^1\{\ Q_1, \ldots, Q_m\ \} &\longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^1\{\ P \parr Q_1, \ldots, P \parr Q_m\ \} \\ P \parr \mathcal{T}^2\{\ Q_{m+1}, \ldots, Q_{m+n}\ \} &\longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^2\{\ P \parr Q_{m+1}, \ldots, P \parr Q_{m+n}\ \} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by distributivity the following derivation can be constructed.

$$\begin{aligned} P \parr \Big(\mathcal{T}^1\{\ Q_1, \ldots, Q_m\ \}\ \&\ \mathcal{T}^2\{\ Q_{m+1}, \ldots, Q_{m+n}\ \}\Big) \\ \longrightarrow P \parr \mathcal{T}^1\{\ Q_1, \ldots, Q_m\ \}\ \&\ P \parr \mathcal{T}^2\{\ Q_{m+1}, \ldots, Q_{m+n}\ \} \\ \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^1\{\ P \parr Q_1, \ldots, P \parr Q_m\ \}\ \&\ \mathcal{T}^2\{\ P \parr Q_{m+1}, \ldots, P \parr Q_{m+n}\ \} \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, $\mathcal{T}^1\{ \mathrm{I}, \ldots, \mathrm{I} \} \,\&\, \mathcal{T}^2\{ \mathrm{I}, \ldots, \mathrm{I} \} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I} \,\&\, \mathrm{I} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$ holds.

As the induction hypothesis, assume $P \parallel \mathcal{T}\{ Q_1, \ldots, Q_n \} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{ P \parallel Q_1, \ldots, P \parallel Q_n \}$ and also that $\vdash \mathcal{T}\{ \mathrm{I}, \ldots, \mathrm{I} \}$. Hence, given $x \# P$, the following derivation holds.

$$P \parallel \mathit{\Pi} x \mathcal{T}\{ Q_1, \ldots, Q_n \} \longrightarrow \mathit{\Pi} x (P \parallel \mathcal{T}\{ Q_1, \ldots, Q_n \}) \longrightarrow \mathit{\Pi} x \mathcal{T}\{ P \parallel Q_1, \ldots, P \parallel Q_n \}$$

Furthermore, $\mathit{\Pi} x \mathcal{T}\{ \mathrm{I}, \ldots, \mathrm{I} \} \longrightarrow \mathit{\Pi} x \mathrm{I} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$.

A similar argument holds for a killing context of the form $\forall x \mathcal{T}\{\ \}$. □

For readability of large predicates involving an n-ary killing context, we introduce the notation $\mathcal{T}\{ Q_i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \}$ as shorthand for $\mathcal{T}\{ Q_1, Q_2, \ldots, Q_n \}$; and $\mathcal{T}\{ Q_i \colon i \in I \}$ for a family of predicates indexed by finite subset of natural numbers I. Killing contexts also satisfy the following property that is necessary for handling the *seq* operator, which interacts subtly with killing contexts.

▶ **Lemma 14.** *Assume that I is a finite subset of natural numbers, P_i and Q_i are predicates, for $i \in I$, and $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ is a killing context. There exist killing contexts $\mathcal{T}^0\{\ \}$ and $\mathcal{T}^1\{\ \}$ and sets of natural numbers $J \subseteq I$ and $K \subseteq I$ such that the following derivation holds.*

$$\mathcal{T}\{ P_i \,;\, Q_i \colon i \in I \} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^0\Big\{ P_j \colon j \in J \Big\} \,;\, \mathcal{T}^1\{ Q_k \colon k \in K \}$$

Proof. Proceed by induction on the structure of the killing context. The base case is immediate.

Consider a predicate of the the form $\mathit{\Pi} x \mathcal{T}\{ P_i \,;\, Q_i \colon i \in I \}$. By the induction hypothesis, assume there exists $\mathcal{T}^0\{\ \}$ and $\mathcal{T}^1\{\ \}$ such that $\mathcal{T}\{ P_i \,;\, Q_i \colon i \in I \} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^0\Big\{ P_j \colon j \in J \Big\} \,;\, \mathcal{T}^1\{ Q_k \colon k \in K \}$, where $J \subseteq I$ and $K \subseteq I$. There are three cases to consider.

If $\mathcal{T}^0\Big\{ P_j \colon j \in J \Big\} \equiv \mathrm{I}$, then the following derivation holds.

$$\mathit{\Pi} x \mathcal{T}\{ P_i \,;\, Q_i \colon i \in I \} \longrightarrow \mathit{\Pi} x \Big(\mathrm{I} \,;\, \mathcal{T}^1\{ Q_k \colon k \in K \}\Big) \equiv \mathrm{I} \,;\, \mathit{\Pi} x \mathcal{T}^1\{ Q_k \colon k \in K \}$$

If $\mathcal{T}^1\{ Q_k \colon k \in K \} \equiv \mathrm{I}$, then the following derivation holds.

$$\mathit{\Pi} x \mathcal{T}\{ P_i \,;\, Q_i \colon i \in I \} \longrightarrow \mathit{\Pi} x \Big(\mathcal{T}^0\Big\{ P_j \colon j \in J \Big\} \,;\, \mathrm{I}\Big) \equiv \mathit{\Pi} x \mathcal{T}^0\Big\{ P_j \colon j \in J \Big\} \,;\, \mathrm{I}$$

Otherwise, $\mathcal{T}^0\Big\{ P_j \colon j \in J \Big\} \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ and $\mathcal{T}^1\{ Q_k \colon k \in K \} \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ in which case the *medial new* rule can be applied as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathit{\Pi} x \mathcal{T}\{ P_i \,;\, Q_i \colon i \in I \} &\longrightarrow \mathit{\Pi} x \Big(\mathcal{T}^0\Big\{ P_j \colon j \in J \Big\} \,;\, \mathcal{T}^1\{ Q_k \colon k \in K \}\Big) \\ &\longrightarrow \mathit{\Pi} x \mathcal{T}^0\Big\{ P_j \colon j \in J \Big\} \,;\, \mathit{\Pi} x \mathcal{T}^1\{ Q_k \colon k \in K \} \end{aligned}$$

In each of the three cases above trivial contexts of the correct form are obtained.

Now consider a predicate of the form $\mathcal{T}^0\{ P_i \,;\, Q_i \colon i \in I_0 \} \,\&\, \mathcal{T}^1\{ P_i \,;\, Q_i \colon i \in I_1 \}$. By induction, the following derivations can be constructed where $J_0 \subseteq I_0$, $K_0 \subseteq I_0$, $J_1 \subseteq I_1$ and $K_1 \subseteq I_1$.

$$\mathcal{T}^0\{ P_i \,;\, Q_i \colon i \in I_0 \} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^0_0\Big\{ P_j \colon j \in J_0 \Big\} \,;\, \mathcal{T}^0_1\{ Q_k \colon k \in K_0 \}$$

$$\mathcal{T}^1\{ P_i \,;\, Q_i \colon i \in I_1 \} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^1_0\Big\{ P_j \colon j \in J_1 \Big\} \,;\, \mathcal{T}^1_1\{ Q_k \colon k \in K_1 \}$$

There are three cases to consider. If $\mathcal{T}^0_0\Big\{ P_j \colon j \in J_0 \Big\} \equiv \mathrm{I}$ and $\mathcal{T}^1_0\Big\{ P_j \colon j \in J_1 \Big\} \equiv \mathrm{I}$, then the following derivation holds.

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{T}^0\{ P_i \,;\, Q_i \colon i \in I_0 \} \,\&\, \mathcal{T}^1\{ P_i \,;\, Q_i \colon i \in I_1 \} \\ &\quad\longrightarrow\quad \mathcal{T}^0_1\{ Q_k \colon k \in K_0 \} \,\&\, \mathcal{T}^1_1\{ Q_k \colon k \in K_1 \} \equiv \mathrm{I} \,;\, \Big(\mathcal{T}^0\{ Q_k \colon k \in K_0 \} \,\&\, \mathcal{T}^1\{ Q_k \colon k \in K_1 \}\Big) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if $\mathcal{T}_1^0\{\ Q_k : k \in K_0\ \} \equiv \mathrm{I}$ and $\mathcal{T}_1^1\{\ Q_k : k \in K_1\ \} \equiv \mathrm{I}$, then the following derivation holds.

$$\begin{array}{rl} & \mathcal{T}^0\{\ P_i\ ;\ Q_i : i \in I_0\ \}\ \&\ \mathcal{T}^1\{\ P_i\ ;\ Q_i : i \in I_1\ \} \\ \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}_0^0\Big\{\ P_j : j \in J_0\ \Big\}\ \&\ \mathcal{T}_0^1\Big\{\ P_j : j \in J_1\ \Big\} \equiv \Big(\mathcal{T}^0\Big\{\ P_j : j \in J_0\ \Big\}\ \&\ \mathcal{T}^1\Big\{\ P_j : j \in J_1\ \Big\}\Big)\ ;\ \mathrm{I} \end{array}$$

Otherwise, either $\mathcal{T}_0^0\Big\{\ P_j : j \in J_0\ \Big\} \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ or $\mathcal{T}_0^1\Big\{\ P_j : j \in J_1\ \Big\} \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ and also either $\mathcal{T}_1^0\{\ Q_k : k \in K_0\ \} \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ or $\mathcal{T}_1^1\{\ Q_k : k \in K_1\ \} \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$. Hence by the *medial* rule the following derivation can be constructed.

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathcal{T}^0\{\ P_i\ ;\ Q_i : i \in I_0\ \}\ \&\ \mathcal{T}^1\{\ P_i\ ;\ Q_i : i \in I_1\ \} \\ \qquad \longrightarrow \Big(\mathcal{T}_0^0\Big\{\ P_j : j \in J_0\ \Big\}\ ;\mathcal{T}_1^0\{\ Q_k : k \in K_0\ \}\Big)\ \&\ \Big(\mathcal{T}_0^1\Big\{\ P_j : j \in J_1\ \Big\}\ ;\mathcal{T}_1^1\{\ Q_k : k \in K_1\ \}\Big) \\ \qquad \longrightarrow \Big(\mathcal{T}_0^0\Big\{\ P_j : j \in J_0\ \Big\}\ \&\ \mathcal{T}_0^1\Big\{\ P_j : j \in J_1\ \Big\}\Big)\ ;\ \Big(\mathcal{T}_1^0\{\ Q_k : k \in K_0\ \}\ \&\ \mathcal{T}_1^1\{\ Q_k : k \in K_1\ \}\Big) \end{array}$$

Notice that $\mathcal{T}_0^0\{\ \}\ \&\ \mathcal{T}_0^1\{\ \}$ and $\mathcal{T}_1^0\{\ \}\ \&\ \mathcal{T}_1^1\{\ \}$ are two killing contexts and $J_0 \cup J_1 \subseteq I_0 \cup I_1$ and $K_0 \cup K_1 \subseteq I_0 \cup I_1$ as required. □

The following lemma checks that *wen* quantifiers can propagate to the front of a killing context.

▶ **Lemma 15.** *Consider an n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ and predicates such that $x \# P_i$ and either $P_i = \Im x Q_i$ or $P_i = Q_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$. If for some i such that $1 \leq i \leq n$, $P_i = \Im x Q_i$, then $\mathcal{T}\{\ P_1, P_2, \ldots P_n\ \} \longrightarrow \Im x \mathcal{T}\{\ Q_1, Q_2, \ldots, Q_n\ \}$.*

Proof. The proof is by induction on the structure of $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$. The base case is immediate.

Assume that $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ is a n-ary killing context and P_i and Q_i are such that $x \# P_i$ and either $P_i = \Im x Q_i$ or $P_i = Q_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$; and also for some i such that $1 \leq i \leq n$, $P_i = \Im x Q_i$. By the induction hypothesis, $\mathcal{T}\{\ P_1, P_2, \ldots P_n\ \} \longrightarrow \Im x \mathcal{T}\{\ Q_1, Q_2, \ldots, Q_n\ \}$. Hence the following derivation can be constructed for $И$.

$$И y \mathcal{T}\{\ P_1, P_2, \ldots P_n\ \} \longrightarrow И y \Im x \mathcal{T}\{\ Q_1, Q_2, \ldots, Q_n\ \} \longrightarrow \Im x И y \mathcal{T}\{\ Q_1, Q_2, \ldots, Q_n\ \}$$

Similarly, the following derivation can be constructed for $\forall$.

$$\forall y \mathcal{T}\{\ P_1, P_2, \ldots P_n\ \} \longrightarrow \forall y \Im x \mathcal{T}\{\ Q_1, Q_2, \ldots, Q_n\ \} \longrightarrow \Im x \forall y \mathcal{T}\{\ Q_1, Q_2, \ldots, Q_n\ \}$$

Now assume that $\mathcal{T}^0\{\ \}$ and $\mathcal{T}^1\{\ \}$ are respectively m-ary and n-ary killing contexts and P_i and Q_i are such that $x \# P_i$ and either $P_i = \Im x Q_i$ or $P_i = Q_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq m+n$; and also for some i such that $1 \leq i \leq m+n$, $P_i = \Im x Q_i$. Assume that, for some j such that $1 \leq j \leq m$, $P_j = \Im x Q_j$. By induction, we have the following derivation. $\mathcal{T}^0\{\ P_1, \ldots, P_m\ \} \longrightarrow \Im x \mathcal{T}^0\{\ Q_1, \ldots, Q_m\ \}$.

Now assume also that there exists k such that $m+1 \leq k \leq m+n$ and $P_k = \Im x Q_k$. In the first case, by induction, the following derivation holds. $\mathcal{T}^1\{\ P_{m+1}, \ldots, P_{m+n}\ \} \longrightarrow \Im x \mathcal{T}^1\{\ Q_{m+1}, \ldots, Q_{m+n}\ \}$.

In this case, the following derivation can be constructed.

$$\begin{array}{rl} \mathcal{T}^0\{\ P_1, \ldots, P_m\ \}\ \&\ \mathcal{T}^1\{\ P_{m+1}, \ldots, P_{m+n}\ \} \longrightarrow & \Im x \mathcal{T}^0\{\ Q_1, \ldots, Q_m\ \}\ \&\ \Im x \mathcal{T}^1\{\ Q_{m+1}, \ldots, Q_{m+n}\ \} \\ \longrightarrow & \Im x \Big(\mathcal{T}^0\{\ Q_1, \ldots, Q_m\ \}\ \&\ \mathcal{T}^1\{\ Q_{m+1}, \ldots, Q_{m+n}\ \}\Big) \end{array}$$

Otherwise $P_\ell = Q_\ell$, hence $x \# Q_\ell$, for all ℓ such that $m+1 \leq \ell \leq m+n$. Thereby $x \# \mathcal{T}^1\{\ Q_1, \ldots, Q_n\ \}$ and hence the follow derivation holds.

$$\begin{array}{rl} \mathcal{T}^0\{\ P_1, \ldots, P_m\ \}\ \&\ \mathcal{T}^1\{\ P_{m+1}, \ldots, P_{m+n}\ \} \longrightarrow & \Im x \mathcal{T}^0\{\ Q_1, \ldots, Q_m\ \}\ \&\ \mathcal{T}^1\{\ Q_{m+1}, \ldots, Q_{m+n}\ \} \\ \longrightarrow & \Im x \Big(\mathcal{T}^0\{\ Q_1, \ldots, Q_m\ \}\ \&\ \mathcal{T}^1\{\ Q_{m+1}, \ldots, Q_{m+n}\ \}\Big) \end{array}$$

The third case when $P_\ell = Q_\ell$ for all ℓ such that $1 \leq \ell \leq m$ is symmetric. □

An Affine Measure for the Size of a Proof.

As an induction measure in splitting lemmas, we employ a multiset-based measure of the size of a proof [15, 43]. Multisets of multisets handle subtle interactions between the unit, *seq* and *with* operators, as explained in detail for MAV [23]. To give weight to nominals a *wen* and *new* count is employed.

▶ **Definition 16.** We denote the standard multiset disjoint union operator as $\uplus$, a multiset sum operator defined such that $M + N = \{m + n \colon m \in M \text{ and } n \in N\}$. We also define pointwise plus and pointwise union over multisets of multisets of natural numbers, where $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ are multisets of multisets. $\mathcal{M} \boxplus \mathcal{N} = \{M + N, M \in \mathcal{M} \text{ and } N \in \mathcal{N}\}$ and $\mathcal{M} \sqcup \mathcal{N} = \{M \uplus N, M \in \mathcal{M} \text{ and } N \in \mathcal{N}\}$.

We employ two distinct multiset orderings over multisets and over multisets of multisets.

▶ **Definition 17.** For multisets of natural numbers M and N, define a multiset ordering $M \leq N$ if and only if there exists an injective multiset function $f \colon M \to N$ such that, for all $m \in M$, $m \leq f(m)$. Strict multiset ordering $M < N$ is defined such that $M \leq N$ but $M \neq N$.

▶ **Definition 18.** Given two multisets of multisets of natural numbers $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$, $\mathcal{M} \sqsubseteq \mathcal{N}$ holds if and only if $\mathcal{M}$ can be obtained from $\mathcal{N}$ by repeatedly removing a multiset N from $\mathcal{N}$ and replacing N with zero or more multisets M_i such that $M_i < N$. $\mathcal{M} \sqsubset \mathcal{N}$ is defined when $\mathcal{M} \sqsubseteq \mathcal{N}$ but $\mathcal{M} \neq \mathcal{N}$.

▶ **Definition 19.** The occurrence count is the following function from predicates to multiset of multisets of natural numbers.

$$|\mathrm{I}|_{occ} = \{\{0\}\} \qquad |\alpha|_{occ} = |\overline{\alpha}|_{occ} = \{\{1\}\}$$

$$|P \mathbin{\&} Q|_{occ} = |P \oplus Q|_{occ} = |P|_{occ} \sqcup |Q|_{occ}$$

$$|\forall x P|_{occ} = |\exists x P|_{occ} = \{\{0\}\} \sqcup |P|_{occ}$$

$$|P \parallel Q|_{occ} = |P|_{occ} \boxplus |Q|_{occ}$$

$$|\mathbin{?} x P|_{occ} = |\Im x P|_{occ} = \begin{cases} \{\{0,0\}\} & \text{if } P \equiv \mathrm{I} \\ |P|_{occ} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$|P \otimes Q|_{occ} = |P \mathbin{;} Q|_{occ} = \begin{cases} |P|_{occ} & \text{if } Q \equiv \mathrm{I} \\ |Q|_{occ} & \text{if } P \equiv \mathrm{I} \\ |P|_{occ} \uplus |Q|_{occ} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

▶ **Definition 20.** The wen count is the following function from predicates to natural numbers.

$$|\Im x P|_{\Im} = 1 + |P|_{\Im} \qquad |\exists x P|_{\Im} = |\forall x P|_{\Im} = |\mathbin{?} x P|_{\Im} = |P|_{\Im} \qquad |\alpha|_{\Im} = |\overline{\alpha}|_{\Im} = |\mathrm{I}|_{\Im} = 1$$

$$|P \mathbin{;} Q|_{\Im} = |P \otimes Q|_{\Im} = |P \parallel Q|_{\Im} = |P|_{\Im}|Q|_{\Im} \qquad |P \oplus Q|_{\Im} = |P \mathbin{\&} Q|_{\Im} = |P|_{\Im} + |Q|_{\Im}$$

▶ **Definition 21.** The new count is the following function from predicates to natural numbers.

$$|\mathbin{?} x P|_{\mathrm{и}} = 1 + |P|_{\mathrm{и}} \qquad |\exists x P|_{\mathrm{и}} = |\forall x P|_{\mathrm{и}} = |\Im x P|_{\mathrm{и}} = |P|_{\mathrm{и}} \qquad |\alpha|_{\mathrm{и}} = |\overline{\alpha}|_{\mathrm{и}} = |\mathrm{I}|_{\mathrm{и}} = 1$$

$$|P \parallel Q|_{\mathrm{и}} = |P|_{\mathrm{и}}|Q|_{\mathrm{и}} \quad |P \oplus Q|_{\mathrm{и}} = |P \mathbin{\&} Q|_{\mathrm{и}} = |P|_{\mathrm{и}} + |Q|_{\mathrm{и}} \quad |P \mathbin{;} Q|_{\mathrm{и}} = |P \otimes Q|_{\mathrm{и}} = \max(|P|_{\mathrm{и}}, |Q|_{\mathrm{и}})$$

▶ **Definition 22.** The size of a predicate $|P|$ is defined as the triple $(|P|_{occ}, |P|_{\Im}, |P|_{\mathrm{и}})$ lexicographically ordered by $\prec$. $\phi \preceq \psi$ is defined such that $\phi \prec \psi$ or $\phi = \psi$ pointwise.

▶ **Definition 23.** The size of a proof is given by the tuples of the form $(|P|, n)$, where n is the length of the derivation $P \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$, such that tuples are lexicographically ordered.

▶ **Lemma 24.** *For any predicate P and term t, $|P| = \left|P\{^{t}/_{x}\}\right|$.*

▶ **Lemma 25.** *If $P \equiv Q$ then $|P| = |Q|$.*

Proof. For commutativity the following arguments hold for *par* and *times*.

$$\begin{aligned}|P \parallel Q|_{occ} = |P|_{occ} \boxplus |Q|_{occ} = \ & \{M + N \colon M \in |P|_{occ}, N \in |Q|_{occ}\} \\ = \ & \{N + M \colon M \in |P|_{occ}, N \in |Q|_{occ}\} = |Q|_{occ} \boxplus |P|_{occ} = |P \parallel Q|_{occ}\end{aligned}$$

$$|P \otimes Q|_{occ} = |P|_{occ} \uplus |Q|_{occ} = |Q|_{occ} \uplus |P|_{occ} = |Q \otimes P|_{occ}$$

$$|P \otimes Q|_{\ni} = |P \parallel Q|_{\ni} = |P|_{\ni}|Q|_{\ni} = |Q|_{\ni}|P|_{\ni} = |Q \parallel P|_{\ni} = |Q \otimes P|_{\ni}$$

$$|P \parallel Q|_{\mathit{И}} = |P|_{\mathit{И}}|Q|_{\mathit{И}} = |Q|_{\mathit{И}}|P|_{\mathit{И}} = |Q \parallel P|_{\mathit{И}}$$

$$|P \otimes Q|_{\mathit{И}} = \max(|P|_{\mathit{И}}, |Q|_{\mathit{И}}) = \max(|Q|_{\mathit{И}}, |P|_{\mathit{И}}) = |Q \otimes P|_{\mathit{И}}$$

The identity rules hold by the following reasoning, where $\odot \in \{\otimes, ;\}$, since $|P|_{\mathit{И}} \geq 1$ always $|P \odot \mathbb{1}|_{\mathit{И}} = \max(|P|_{\mathit{И}}, 1) = |P|_{\mathit{И}}$ and the following hold.

$$|P \parallel \mathbb{1}|_{occ} = |P|_{occ} \boxplus \{\{0\}\} = |P|_{occ} \quad |\mathbb{1} \odot P|_{occ} = |P|_{occ} \quad |P \odot \mathbb{1}|_{\ni} = |P|_{\ni} = |P \parallel \mathbb{1}|_{\ni} \quad |P \parallel \mathbb{1}|_{\mathit{И}} = |P|_{\mathit{И}}$$

Associativity properties hold by extending associativity of multisets to multisets of multisets.

$$\begin{aligned}|(P \parallel Q) \parallel R| = \ & (|P| \boxplus |Q|) \boxplus |R| \\ = \ & \{(M + N) + K \colon M \in |P|, N \in |Q|, K \in |R|\} \\ = \ & \{M + (N + K) : M \in |P|, N \in |Q|, K \in |R|\} \\ = \ & |P| \boxplus (|Q| \boxplus |R|) = |P \parallel (Q \parallel R)|\end{aligned}$$

If any one of $P \equiv \mathbb{1}$, $Q \equiv \mathbb{1}$ or $R \equiv \mathbb{1}$ hold, then $|(P \,;\, Q) \,;\, R| = |P \,;\, (Q \,;\, R)|$ by definition. If $P \not\equiv \mathbb{1}$ and $Q \not\equiv \mathbb{1}$ and $R \not\equiv \mathbb{1}$, then the following equalities hold.

$$|(P \,;\, Q) \,;\, R| = (|P| \uplus |Q|) \uplus |R| = |P| \uplus (|Q| \uplus |R|) = |P \,;\, (Q \,;\, R)|$$

The same associativity argument works for the *times* operator. Furthermore, the following wen count and new count preserve associativity as follows, where $\odot \in \{\otimes, ;\}$.

$$|(P \parallel Q) \parallel R|_{\ni} = |(P \odot Q) \odot R|_{\ni} = (|P|_{\ni}|Q|_{\ni})\,|R|_{\ni} = |P|_{\ni}\,(|Q|_{\ni}|R|_{\ni}) = |P \odot (Q \odot R)|_{\ni} = |P \parallel (Q \parallel R)|_{\ni}$$

$$|(P \parallel Q) \parallel R|_{\mathit{И}} = (|P|_{\mathit{И}}|Q|_{\mathit{И}})\,|R|_{\mathit{И}} = |P|_{\mathit{И}}\,(|Q|_{\mathit{И}}|R|_{\mathit{И}}) = |P \parallel (Q \parallel R)|_{\mathit{И}}$$

$$|(P \odot Q) \odot R|_{\mathit{И}} = \max(\max(|P|_{\mathit{И}}, |Q|_{\mathit{И}}), |R|_{\mathit{И}}) = \max(|P|_{\mathit{И}}, \max(|Q|_{\mathit{И}}, |R|_{\mathit{И}})) = |P \odot (Q \odot R)|_{\mathit{И}}$$

The lemma then follows by induction over the structure of the derivation of $P \equiv Q$. ◻

▶ **Lemma 26** (Affine). *For derivation $P \longrightarrow Q$, the size of the predicate is bound such that $|Q| \preceq |P|$.*

Proof. The proof proceeds by checking that each rule preserves the bound on the size of the predicate, from which the result follows by induction on the length of a derivation.

Consider the case of the *close* rule, where $P \not\equiv \mathbb{1}$ and $Q \not\equiv \mathbb{1}$. For the occurrence count, $|\mathit{И}xP \parallel \mathrel{Э}xQ|_{occ} = |P|_{occ} \boxplus |Q|_{occ} = |\mathit{И}x\,(P \parallel Q)|_{occ}$ and the wen count strictly decreases as follows.

$$|\mathit{И}xP \parallel \mathrel{Э}xQ|_{\ni} = |P|_{\ni} + (\{1\} \uplus |Q|_{\ni}) > |P|_{\ni} + |Q|_{\ni} = |\mathit{И}x\,(P \parallel Q)|_{\ni}$$

Consider the case of the *fresh* rule. For the occurrence count, $|\mathrel{Э}xP|_{occ} = |\mathit{И}xP|_{occ}$ and the wen count strictly decreases as follows. $|\mathrel{Э}xP|_{\ni} = \{1\} \uplus |P|_{\ni} > |P|_{\ni} = |\mathit{И}xP|_{\ni}$.

Consider the case of the *extrude new* rule, where $Q \not\equiv \mathbb{1}$. For the occurrence count, if $P \equiv \mathbb{1}$, $|\mathit{И}xP \parallel Q|_{occ} = \{\{0, 0\}\} \boxplus |Q|_{occ} > |Q|_{occ} = |\mathit{И}xP \parallel Q|_{occ}$. If $P \not\equiv \mathbb{1}$ then $|\mathit{И}xP \parallel Q|_{occ} = |P|_{occ} \boxplus |Q|_{occ} = |\mathit{И}xP \parallel Q|_{occ}$. Furthermore, for the wen count the following equality holds: $|\mathit{И}xP \parallel Q|_{\ni} = (1 + |P|_{\ni})\,|Q|_{\ni} \geq 1 + |P|_{\ni}|Q|_{\ni} = |\mathit{И}x\,(P \parallel Q)|_{\ni}$. The new count is also preserved by the same argument.

Consider the case of the *external* rule, where $R \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$. For the occurrence count, by distributivity of $\sqcup$ over $\boxplus$ the following multiset equality holds.

$$|(P \,\&\, Q) \parallel R|_{occ} = (|P|_{occ} \sqcup |Q|_{occ}) \boxplus R = (|P|_{occ} \boxplus R) \sqcup (|Q|_{occ} \boxplus R) = |(P \parallel R) \,\&\, (Q \parallel R)|_{occ}$$

For the wen count the following equality holds. $|(P \,\&\, Q) \parallel R|_{\ni} = (|P|_{\ni} + |Q|_{\ni})\,|R|_{\ni} = |P|_{\ni}|R|_{\ni} + |Q|_{\ni}|R|_{\ni} = |(P \,\&\, Q) \parallel R|_{\ni}$ Similarly, for the new count.

Consider the case of the *medial wen* rule, where $P \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ and $Q \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$. For the occurrence count, consider each of the operators *par*, *seq* and *with*.

- $|\Im xP \,;\, \Im xQ|_{occ} = |P|_{occ} \uplus |Q|_{occ} = |\Im x\,(P \,;\, Q)|_{occ}$,
- $|\Im xP \parallel \Im xQ|_{occ} = |P|_{occ} \boxplus |Q|_{occ} = |\Im x\,(P \parallel Q)|_{occ}$
- $|\Im xP \,\&\, \Im xQ|_{occ} = |P|_{occ} \sqcup |Q|_{occ} = |\Im x\,(P \,\&\, Q)|_{occ}$

For the wen count and $\odot \in \{\parallel, ;\}$ the following strict inequality holds, noting $|P|_{\ni} \geq 1$ for any predicate.

$$|\Im xP \odot \Im xQ|_{\ni} = (1 + |P|_{\ni})\,(1 + |Q|_{\ni}) = |P|_{\ni} + |P|_{\ni}|Q|_{\ni} + |Q|_{\ni} > 1 + |P|_{\ni}|Q|_{\ni} = |\Im x\,(P \,;\, Q)|_{\ni}$$

Consider the case of the *left wen* rules, where $x \# Q$ and $Q \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$. For the occurrence count, there are six cases covering the operators *seq*, *par* and *with*.

- If $P \equiv \mathrm{I}$ then the following holds for the *seq* operator: $|\Im x\,(P \,;\, Q)|_{occ} = \{\{0, 0\}\} \uplus |Q|_{occ} \sqsubset |Q|_{occ} = |\Im xP \,;\, Q|_{occ}$.
- If $P \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ then the following equality holds for the *seq* operator: $|\Im xP \,;\, Q|_{occ} = |P|_{occ} \uplus |Q|_{occ} = |\Im x\,(P \,;\, Q)|_{occ}$.
- For the *par* and $P \equiv \mathrm{I}$ the following holds: $|\Im x\,(P \,;\, Q)|_{occ} = |Q|_{occ} \sqsubset \{\{0, 0\}\} \boxplus |Q|_{occ} = |\Im xP \parallel Q|_{occ}$.
- For the *par* and $P \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ the following holds: $|\Im xP \parallel Q|_{occ} = |P| \boxplus |Q| = |\Im x\,(P \,;\, Q)|$.
- For the *with* operator and $P \equiv \mathrm{I}$ the following holds: $|\Im xP \,\&\, Q|_{occ} = \{\{0, 0\}\} \sqcup |Q|_{occ} = \{\{0, 0\}\} \sqcup |Q|_{occ} = |\Im x\,(P \,\&\, Q)|_{occ}$
- For the *with* operator and $P \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ the following holds: $|\Im xP \,\&\, Q|_{occ} = |P|_{occ} \sqcup |Q|_{occ} = |\Im x\,(P \,\&\, Q)|_{occ}$.

For the wen count the following multiset inequality holds.

$$|\Im xP \,;\, Q|_{\ni} = (1 + |P|_{\ni})\,|Q|_{\ni} = |Q|_{\ni} + |P|_{\ni}|Q|_{\ni} \geq 1 + |P|_{\ni}|Q|_{\ni} = |\Im x\,(P \,;\, Q)|_{\ni}$$

Also, for the new count the following equality holds: $|\Im xP \,;\, Q|_{\mathrm{и}} = \max(|P|_{\mathrm{и}}, |Q|_{\mathrm{и}}) = |\Im x\,(P \,;\, Q)|_{\mathrm{и}}$. The case for the *right wen* rules are symmetric to the above.

Consider the case for the *extrude* rule, where $Q \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$. The following strict multiset inequality holds, as required.

$$|\forall x\,(P \parallel Q)| = \{\{0\}\} \sqcup (|P| \boxplus |Q|) \sqsubset (\{\{0\}\} \boxplus |Q|) \sqcup (|P| \boxplus |Q|) = (\{\{0\}\} \sqcup |P|) \boxplus |Q| = |\forall xP \parallel Q|$$

Consider the case for the *medial1* rule, where $P \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ and $Q \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$. By distributivity of $\uplus$ over $\sqcup$ the following multiset equality holds.

$$|\forall x\,(P \,;\, Q)| = \{\{0\}\} \sqcup (|P| \uplus |Q|) \qquad = (\{\{0\}\} \sqcup |P|) \uplus (\{\{0\}\} \sqcup |Q|) \qquad = |\forall xP \,;\, \forall xQ|$$

Also $|\forall x\,(P \,;\, Q)|_{\ni} = |\forall xP \,;\, \forall xQ|_{\ni}$ and $|\forall x\,(P \,;\, Q)|_{\mathrm{и}} = |\forall xP \,;\, \forall xQ|_{\mathrm{и}}$.

Consider the case for the *select* rule. By Lemma 24, the following strict multiset inequality holds: $|\exists xP| = \{\{0\}\} \sqcup |P| \sqsubset |P| = \left|P\{{}^{t}/_{x}\}\right|$.

Consider the case for the *switch* rule, where $P \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ and $R \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$. If $Q \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$, then, since $R \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ we have $\{\{0\}\} \sqsubset |R|_{occ}$ and hence $|P|_{occ} = |P|_{occ} \uplus \{\{0\}\} \sqsubset |P|_{occ} \uplus |R|_{occ}$; and therefore the following holds since $\uplus$ distributes over $\uplus$.

$$\begin{aligned} |P \otimes (Q \parallel R)|_{occ} = \; & |P|_{occ} \uplus (|Q|_{occ} \uplus |R|_{occ}) \\ \sqsubset \; & (|P|_{occ} \uplus |R|_{occ}) \uplus (|Q|_{occ} \uplus |R|_{occ}) \\ = \; & (|P|_{occ} \uplus |Q|_{occ}) \uplus |R|_{occ} = |(P \otimes Q) \parallel R|_{occ} \end{aligned}$$

If $Q \equiv \mathrm{I}$ then, since $\{\{0\}\} \sqsubset |P|_{occ}$ and $\{\{0\}\} \sqsubset |R|_{occ}$, the following hold.

$$|P \otimes (\mathrm{I} \parallel R)|_{occ} = |P|_{occ} \uplus |R|_{occ} \sqsubset |P|_{occ} \uplus |R|_{occ} = |(P \otimes \mathrm{I}) \parallel R|_{occ}$$

Consider the case of the *sequence* rule, where $P \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ and $Q \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$. If $Q \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ and $R \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$, then the following holds since $\uplus$ distributes of $\uplus$.

$$\begin{aligned} |(P \parallel R) \,;\, (Q \parallel S)|_{occ} = \; & (|P|_{occ} \uplus |R|_{occ}) \uplus (|Q|_{occ} \uplus |S|_{occ}) \\ \sqsubset \; & (|P|_{occ} \uplus |R|_{occ}) \uplus (|Q|_{occ} \uplus |S|_{occ}) \uplus (|P|_{occ} \uplus |S|_{occ}) \uplus (|Q|_{occ} \uplus |R|_{occ}) \\ = \; & (|P|_{occ} \uplus |Q|_{occ}) \uplus (|R|_{occ} \uplus |S|_{occ}) = |(P \,;\, Q) \uplus (R \parallel S)|_{occ} \end{aligned}$$

If $Q \equiv \mathrm{I}$ and $R \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$, then, since $\{\{0\}\} \sqsubset |R|_{occ}$, and hence $|S|_{occ} = |S|_{occ} \uplus \{\{0\}\} \sqsubset |S|_{occ} \uplus |R|_{occ}$, therefore since $\uplus$ distributes over $\uplus$.

$$\begin{aligned} |(P \parallel R) \,;\, (\mathrm{I} \parallel S)|_{occ} = \; & (|P|_{occ} \uplus |R|_{occ}) \uplus |S|_{occ} \\ \sqsubset \; & (|P|_{occ} \uplus |R|_{occ}) \uplus (|P|_{occ} \uplus |S|_{occ}) \\ = \; & |P|_{occ} \uplus (|R|_{occ} \uplus |S|_{occ}) = |(P \,;\, \mathrm{I}) \uplus (R \parallel S)|_{occ} \end{aligned}$$

A symmetric argument holds when $Q \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ and $R \equiv \mathrm{I}$.

If $Q \equiv \mathrm{I}$ and $R \equiv \mathrm{I}$, then $\{\{0\}\} \sqsubset |P|_{occ}$ and $\{\{0\}\} \sqsubset |S|_{occ}$; hence the following strict inequality holds.

$$|(P \parallel \mathrm{I}) \,;\, (\mathrm{I} \parallel S)|_{occ} = |P|_{occ} \uplus |S|_{occ} \sqsubset |P|_{occ} \uplus |S|_{occ} = |(P \,;\, \mathrm{I}) \parallel (\mathrm{I} \,;\, S)|_{occ}$$

Consider the case of the *medial new* rule where $P \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ and $Q \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$. For occurrences, $|\mathit{И}x\,(P \,;\, Q)|_{occ} = |P|_{occ} \uplus |Q|_{occ} = |\mathit{И}xP \,;\, \mathit{И}xQ|_{occ}$. For the wen count, $|\mathit{И}x\,(P \,;\, Q)|_{\ni} = |\mathit{И}xP \,;\, \mathit{И}xQ|_{\ni}$. For the new count the following equalities hold.

$$|\mathit{И}x\,(P \,;\, Q)|_{\mathit{и}} = 1 + \max(|P|_{\mathit{и}}, |Q|_{\mathit{и}}) = \max(1 + |P|_{\mathit{и}}, 1 + |Q|_{\mathit{и}}) = |\mathit{И}xP \,;\, \mathit{И}xQ|_{\mathit{и}}$$

Consider the case for the *medial* rule, where either $P \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ or $R \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ and also either $Q \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ or $S \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$. For when all of P, Q, R and S are not equivalent to the unit.

$$\begin{aligned} |(P \,\&\, R) \,;\, (Q \,\&\, S)| = \; & (|P| \sqcup |R|) \uplus (|Q| \sqcup |S|) \\ \sqsubset \; & (|P| \sqcup |R|) \uplus (|Q| \sqcup |S|) \uplus (|P| \sqcup |S|) \uplus (|Q| \sqcup |R|) \\ = \; & (|P| \uplus |Q|) \sqcup (|R| \uplus |S|) = |(P \,;\, Q) \,\&\, (R \,;\, S)| \end{aligned}$$

For when exactly one of P, Q, R and S is equivalent to the unit, all cases are symmetric. Without loss of generality suppose that $S \equiv \mathrm{I}$ (and possibly also $Q \equiv \mathrm{I}$, but $R \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$). By distributivity of $\uplus$ over $\sqcup$ the following holds.

$$\begin{aligned} |(P \,\&\, R) \,;\, (Q \,\&\, \mathrm{I})| = \; & (|P| \sqcup |R|) \uplus (|Q| \sqcup \{\{0\}\}) \\ \sqsubset \; & (|P| \sqcup |R|) \uplus (|Q| \sqcup |R|) \\ = \; & (|P| \uplus |Q|) \sqcup |R| = |(P \,;\, Q) \,\&\, (R \,;\, \mathrm{I})| \end{aligned}$$

There is one more form of case to consider for the medial: either $P \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$, $Q \equiv \mathrm{I}$, $R \equiv \mathrm{I}$ and $S \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$; or $P \equiv \mathrm{I}$, $Q \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$, $R \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ and $S \equiv \mathrm{I}$. We consider only the former case. The later case, can be treated symmetrically. Since $P \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ and $S \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$, $\{\{0\}\} \sqsubset |P|$ and $\{\{0\}\} \sqsubset |S|$. Therefore, $|P| \sqcup \{\{0\}\} \sqsubset |P| \sqcup |S|$ and $|Q| \sqcup \{\{0\}\} \sqsubset |P| \sqcup |S|$. Hence, we have established that $(|P| \sqcup \{\{0\}\}) \uplus (|Q| \sqcup \{\{0\}\}) \sqsubset |P| \sqcup |S|$.

Note that the restriction on the *medial* rule, either $P \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ or $R \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ and also either $Q \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ or $S \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$, excludes any further cases. Hence we have established that $|(P \,\&\, R)\,;\,(Q \,\&\, S)|_{occ} \sqsubset |(P\,;\,Q) \,\&\, (R\,;\,S)|_{occ}$. Wen new counts need not be considered due to lexicographical ordering.

The cases for the rules *tidy*, *tidy new*, *left choice*, *right choice*, *atomic interact* are relatively straightforward to establish by using the following multiset inequalities.

$$|\mathrm{I}| \sqsubset |\mathrm{I} \,\&\, \mathrm{I}| \quad |\mathrm{I}| \sqsubset |\nabla x \mathrm{I}| \quad |\mathrm{I}| \sqsubset |\overline{a} \,\&\, a| \quad |P| \sqsubset |P \oplus Q| \quad |Q| \sqsubset |P \oplus Q|$$

Hence the lemma holds by induction on the length of the derivation. □

3.4 The Splitting Technique for Simulating the Sequent Calculus

The technique called splitting [20, 21] generalises the application of rules in the sequent calculus. In the sequent calculus, any root connective in a sequent can be selected and some rule for that connective can be applied. In this setting, a sequent corresponds to a structure with *par* at the root. Splitting proves that a sequent like structure can always be rewritten into a form such that a rule can be applied for a distinguished *principal predicate* in the structure. The cases for *times*, *seq*, *new* and *wen* are treated together in a *core* splitting lemma. These operators give rise to *commutative cases*, where rules for these operators can permute with any principal predicate. *Principal cases* are where the root connective of the principal predicate is directly involved in the bottommost rule of a proof. As with MAV [23], the *principal cases* for *seq* are challenging, demanding Lemma 14. The principal case induced by *medial new* demands Lemma 15. The cases where two nominal quantifiers commute are also interesting, particularly where the case arrises due to *equivariance*.

▶ **Lemma 27** (Core Splitting). *The following statements hold.*

- *If* $\vdash (S \otimes T) \parallel U$, *then there exist predicates* V_i *and* W_i *such that* $\vdash S \parallel V_i$ *and* $\vdash T \parallel W_i$, *where* $1 \leq i \leq n$, *and n-ary killing context* $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ *such that* $U \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ V_1 \parallel W_1, V_2 \parallel W_2, \ldots, V_n \parallel W_n\ \}$ *and if* x *appears in* $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ *then* $x \,\#\, (S \otimes T)$.
- *If* $\vdash (S\ ;\ T) \parallel U$, *then there exist predicates* V_i *and* W_i *such that* $\vdash S \parallel V_i$ *and* $\vdash T \parallel W_i$, *where* $1 \leq i \leq n$, *and n-ary killing context* $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ *such that* $U \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ V_1\ ;\ W_1, V_2\ ;\ W_2, \ldots, V_n\ ;\ W_n\ \}$ *and if* x *appears in* $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ *then* $x \,\#\, (S\ ;\ T)$.
- *If* $\vdash \nabla x S \parallel U$, *then there exist predicates* V *and* W *where* $x \,\#\, V$ *and* $\vdash S \parallel W$ *and either* $V = W$ *or* $V = \Im y W$, *such that derivation* $U \longrightarrow V$ *holds.*
- *If* $\vdash \Im x S \parallel U$, *then there exist predicates* V *and* W *where* $x \,\#\, V$ *and* $\vdash S \parallel W$ *and either* $V = W$ *or* $V = \Im y W$, *such that derivation* $U \longrightarrow V$ *holds.*

Furthermore, for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, *in the first two cases the size of the proofs of* $S \parallel V_i$ *and* $T \parallel W_i$ *are bounded above by the size of the proofs of* $(S \otimes T) \parallel U$ *and* $(S\ ;\ T) \parallel U$. *In the third and fourth cases, the size of the proof* $S \parallel W$ *is bounded above by the size of the proofs of* $\nabla x S \parallel U$ *and* $\Im x S \parallel U$.

Proof. The proof proceeds by induction on the size of the proof, as in Defn. 23.

To handle certain cases influenced by equivariance the following definitions are helpful. Assume $\vec{y}$ defines a possibly empty list of variables $y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n$ and $\mathrm{O}\vec{y}P$ is an abbreviation for $\mathrm{O}y_1\mathrm{O}y_2 \ldots \mathrm{O}y_n P$. Let $\vec{y} \,\#\, P$ holds only if $y \,\#\, P$ for every $y \in \vec{y}$. By induction over the length of $\vec{z}$ we can establish that, if $\vec{y} \subseteq \vec{z}$ and $\vec{z} \,\#\, \Im\vec{y}P$ then $\Im\vec{y}P \parallel \nabla\vec{z}Q \longrightarrow \nabla\vec{z}(P \parallel Q)$ and also $\nabla\vec{y}P \parallel \Im\vec{z}Q \longrightarrow \nabla\vec{z}(P \parallel Q)$.

The base case for *new* follows since if $\vec{y}\mathrm{I} \parallel P$, where $\vec{y} \,\#\, P$ then, by applying Lemma 8 inductively to variables in $\vec{y}$, $\vdash P$ as required.

Principal cases for wen. There are four principal cases for wen.

The first principal case for *wen* is when the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $\Im xP \parallel \mathit{И}xQ \parallel R \longrightarrow \mathit{И}x(P \parallel Q) \parallel R$, where $\vdash \mathit{И}x(P \parallel Q) \parallel R$ and $x \# R$. By induction, there exist S and T such that $\vdash P \parallel Q \parallel T$ and $x \# S$ and either $S = T$ or $S = \Im xT$, and also $R \longrightarrow S$. Since $x \# S$, if $S = T$ then $\mathit{И}xQ \parallel S \longrightarrow \mathit{И}x(Q \parallel T)$. Furthermore, the size of the proof of $P \parallel Q \parallel T$ is no larger than the size of the proof of $\mathit{И}x(P \parallel Q) \parallel R$; hence strictly bounded by the size of the proof of $\Im xP \parallel \mathit{И}xQ \parallel R$. If $S = \Im xT$ then $\mathit{И}xQ \parallel \Im xT \longrightarrow \mathit{И}x(Q \parallel T)$. Hence the derivation $\mathit{И}xQ \parallel R \longrightarrow \mathit{И}xQ \parallel S \longrightarrow \mathit{И}x(Q \parallel T)$ can be constructed, as required.

Consider the second principal case for *wen* where the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $\Im xP \parallel \Im xQ \parallel R \longrightarrow \Im x(P \parallel Q) \parallel R$, where $\vdash \Im x(P \parallel Q) \parallel R$ and $x \# R$. By induction, there exist S and T such that and $\vdash P \parallel Q \parallel T$ and $x \# S$ and either $S = T$ or $S = \mathit{И}xT$, and also $R \longrightarrow S$. Furthermore, the size of the proof of $P \parallel Q \parallel T$ is no larger than the size of the proof of $\Im x(P \parallel Q) \parallel R$; hence strictly bounded by the size of the proof of $\Im xP \parallel \Im xQ \parallel R$. Since $x \# S$, if $S = T$ then $\Im xQ \parallel S \longrightarrow \Im x(Q \parallel T) \longrightarrow \mathit{И}x(Q \parallel T)$. If $S = \mathit{И}xT$ then $\Im xQ \parallel \mathit{И}xT \longrightarrow \mathit{И}x(Q \parallel T)$. Hence the derivation $\Im xQ \parallel R \longrightarrow \Im xQ \parallel S \longrightarrow \mathit{И}x(Q \parallel T)$ can be constructed, as required.

Another similar principal cases for *wen* is where the first the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $\Im xP \parallel Q \parallel R \longrightarrow \Im x(P \parallel Q) \parallel R$, where $\vdash \Im x(P \parallel Q) \parallel R$ and $x \# Q \parallel R$. By induction, there exist S and T such that and $\vdash P \parallel Q \parallel T$ and either $S = T$ or $S = \mathit{И}xT$, and also $R \longrightarrow S$. Furthermore, the size of the proof of $P \parallel Q \parallel T$ is no larger than the size of the proof of $\Im x(P \parallel Q) \parallel R$; hence strictly bounded by the size of the proof of $\Im xP \parallel Q \parallel R$. If $S = T$ define $U = Q \parallel T$, and if $S = \mathit{И}xT$ define $U = \mathit{И}x(Q \parallel T)$. In the case $S = \mathit{И}xT$, since $x \# Q$, $Q \parallel \mathit{И}xT \longrightarrow \mathit{И}x(Q \parallel T)$. Hence the following derivation $Q \parallel R \longrightarrow Q \parallel S \longrightarrow U$ can be constructed, as required.

Consider the principal case for *wen* when $\Im x\Im\vec{y}P \parallel Q \longrightarrow \Im\vec{y}\mathit{И}xP \parallel Q$ is the form of the bottommost rule of a proof, where $\vdash \Im\vec{y}\mathit{И}xP \parallel Q$. Notice that $\vec{y}$ is required to handle equivarience. By applying the induction hypothesis inductively on the length of $\vec{y}$, there exist $\vec{z}$ and $\hat{Q}$ such that $\vec{z} \subseteq \vec{y}$ and $\vec{y} \# \mathit{И}\vec{z}\hat{Q}$ and $\vdash \mathit{И}xP \parallel \hat{Q}$, and also $Q \longrightarrow \mathit{И}\vec{z}\hat{Q}$. Furthermore, the size of the proof of $\mathit{И}xP \parallel \hat{Q}$ is bounded above by the size of the proof of $\Im\vec{y}\mathit{И}xP \parallel Q$. By the induction hypothesis, there exist R and S such that $x \# R$, $\vdash P \parallel S$ and either $R = S$ or $R = \Im xS$, and also $\hat{Q} \longrightarrow R$.

There are two cases to consider. If $R = S$ then let $T = \mathit{И}\vec{z}S$; and if $R = \Im xS$ then let $T = \mathit{И}x\mathit{И}\vec{z}S$. In the case $R = \Im xS$, $\mathit{И}\vec{z}R \longrightarrow \mathit{И}\vec{z}\mathit{И}xS \equiv T$. In either case $x \# T$. Thereby we can construct the derivation $Q \longrightarrow \mathit{И}\vec{z}\hat{Q} \longrightarrow \mathit{И}\vec{z}R \longrightarrow T$. Furthermore, the proof $\Im\vec{y}P \parallel \mathit{И}\vec{z}S \longrightarrow \mathit{И}\vec{y}(P \parallel S) \longrightarrow \mathit{И}\vec{y}\mathbb{1} \longrightarrow \mathbb{1}$ can be constructed and, furthermore, $\left|\Im\vec{y}P \parallel \mathit{И}\vec{z}S\right| \prec \left|\Im x\Im\vec{y}P \parallel Q\right|$, since by Lemma 26 $\left|\mathit{И}\vec{z}S\right| \preceq |Q|$ and the *wen* count strictly decreases.

Principal cases for new. There are four principal cases for *new*.

This first is when the bottommost rule of a proof is $\mathit{И}xP \parallel \Im xQ \parallel R \longrightarrow \mathit{И}x(P \parallel Q) \parallel R$, where $\vdash \mathit{И}x(P \parallel Q) \parallel R$. By induction, there exist predicates U and V and $\vdash P \parallel Q \parallel V$ and $x \# U$ and either $U = V$ or $U = \Im xV$, and also $R \longrightarrow U$. Furthermore, the size of the proof of $P \parallel Q \parallel V$ is no larger than the size of the proof of $\mathit{И}x(P \parallel Q) \parallel R$; hence strictly bounded by the size of the proof of $\mathit{И}xP \parallel \Im xQ \parallel R$. In the case that $U = V$, the following derivation can be constructed, since $x \# U$, $\Im xQ \parallel V \longrightarrow \Im x(Q \parallel V)$. In the case that $U = \Im xV$, we have derivation $\Im xQ \parallel \Im xV \longrightarrow \Im x(Q \parallel V)$. Hence, by applying one of the above cases the following derivation $\Im xQ \parallel R \longrightarrow \Im xQ \parallel U \longrightarrow \Im x(Q \parallel V)$ can be constructed as required.

The second principal case for *new* is when the bottommost rule of a proof begins as follows, where $x \# Q$. $\mathit{И}xP \parallel Q \parallel R \longrightarrow \mathit{И}x(P \parallel Q) \parallel R$ where $\vdash \mathit{И}x(P \parallel Q) \parallel R$ is provable. By, the induction hypothesis, there exist predicates U and V where $\vdash P \parallel Q \parallel V$ and either $U = V$ or $U = \Im xV$, and

also $R \longrightarrow U$. Furthermore, the size of the proof of $P \parallel Q \parallel V$ is bounded above by the size of the proof of $И x\,(P \parallel Q) \parallel R$; thereby strictly bounded by the size of the proof of $И x P \parallel Q \parallel R$.

If $U = \Im x V$, define $W = \Im x\,(Q \parallel V)$, and if $U = V$ define $W = Q \parallel V$. In the cases where $U = \Im x V$, since $x \# Q$, $Q \parallel \Im x V \longrightarrow \Im x\,(Q \parallel V) = W$. In the cases where $U = V$, $Q \parallel U = W$. Hence the derivation $Q \parallel R \longrightarrow Q \parallel U \longrightarrow W$ can be constructed, as required.

Consider the third principal case for *new* where the *medial new* rule is the bottommost rule of a proof of the form $И x И \vec{y}\,(P \mathbin{;} Q) \parallel R \longrightarrow И \vec{y}\,(И x P \mathbin{;} И x Q) \parallel R$ such that $\vdash И \vec{y}\,(И x P \parallel И x Q) \parallel R$. The $\vec{y}$ is required to handle cases induced by equivariance. By applying the induction hypothesis repeatedly, there exists $\vec{z}$ and $\hat{R}$ such that $\vec{z} \subseteq \vec{y}$ and $\vec{y} \# \Im \vec{z} \hat{R}$ and $\vdash (И x P \mathbin{;} И x Q) \parallel \hat{R}$, and also $R \longrightarrow \hat{R}$. Furthermore, the size of the proof of $(И x P \mathbin{;} И x Q) \parallel \hat{R}$ is bounded above by the size of the proof of $И \vec{y}\,(И x P \mathbin{;} И x Q) \parallel R$.

By the induction hypothesis, there exist S_i and T_i such that $\vdash И x P \parallel S_i$ and $\vdash И x Q \parallel T_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and n-ary killing context such that $\hat{R} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{ S_1 \mathbin{;} T_1, S_2 \mathbin{;} T_2, \ldots, S_n \mathbin{;} T_n \}$. Furthermore, the size of the proofs of $И x P \parallel S_i$ and $И x Q \parallel T_i$ are bounded above by the size of the proof of $(И x P \mathbin{;} И x Q) \parallel R$.

By the induction hypothesis again, there exist U^i and $\hat{U}^i$ such that $\vdash P \parallel \hat{U}^i$ and $x \# U^i$ and either $U^i = \hat{U}^i$ or $U^i = \Im x \hat{U}^i$, and also $S_i \longrightarrow U^i$. Also by the induction hypothesis, there exist V^i and $\hat{V}^i$ such that $\vdash Q \parallel \hat{V}^i$ and $x \# V^i$ and either $V^i = \hat{V}^i$ or $V^i = \Im x \hat{V}^i$, and also $T_i \longrightarrow V^i$.

Now define W and $\hat{W}$ such that $\hat{W} = \Im \vec{z} \mathcal{T}\left\{ \hat{U}^i \mathbin{;} \hat{V}^i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \right\}$ and, if for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, $U^i = \hat{U}^i$ and $V^i = \hat{V}^i$, then $W = \hat{W}$; otherwise $W = \Im x \hat{W}$. Hence for each i, one of the of the following derivations holds.

- $U^i = \hat{U}^i$ and $V^i = \hat{V}^i$ hence $U^i \mathbin{;} V^i = \hat{U}^i \mathbin{;} \hat{V}^i$.
- If $U^i = \Im x \hat{U}^i$ and $V^i = \hat{V}^i$, hence $x \# V^i$, by the *left wen* rule $\Im x \hat{U}^i \mathbin{;} \hat{V}^i \longrightarrow \Im x \left(\hat{U}^i \mathbin{;} \hat{V}^i \right)$.
- If $U^i = \hat{U}^i$, hence $x \# \hat{U}^i$, and $V^i = \Im x \hat{V}^i$, by the *right wen* rule $U^i \mathbin{;} \Im x \hat{V}^i \longrightarrow \Im x \left(\hat{U}^i \mathbin{;} \hat{V}^i \right)$.
- Otherwise by the *medial wen* rule $\Im x \hat{U}^i \mathbin{;} \Im x \hat{V}^i \longrightarrow \Im x \left(\hat{U}^i \mathbin{;} \hat{V}^i \right)$

If for all i such that $1 \leq i \leq n$, $U^i = \hat{U}^i$ and $V^i = \hat{V}^i$ then $W = \hat{W}$. Otherwise, by Lemma 15, $\Im \vec{z} \mathcal{T}\left\{ U^i \mathbin{;} V^i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \right\} \longrightarrow \Im \vec{z} \Im x \mathcal{T}\left\{ \hat{U}^i \mathbin{;} \hat{V}^i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \right\} \equiv W$. Thereby the following derivation can be constructed.

$$R \longrightarrow \Im \vec{z} \hat{R} \longrightarrow \Im \vec{z} \mathcal{T}\{ S_i \mathbin{;} T_i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \} \longrightarrow \Im \vec{z} \mathcal{T}\left\{ U^i \mathbin{;} V^i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \right\} \longrightarrow W$$

Furthermore, the following proof can be constructed.

$$\begin{array}{rcl} И \vec{y}\,(P \mathbin{;} Q) \parallel \hat{W} \longrightarrow & И \vec{y} \left((P \mathbin{;} Q) \parallel \mathcal{T}\left\{ \hat{U}^i \mathbin{;} \hat{V}^i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \right\} \right) \\ \longrightarrow & И \vec{y} \left(\mathcal{T}\left\{ (P \mathbin{;} Q) \parallel \left(\hat{U}^i \mathbin{;} \hat{V}^i \right) \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \right\} \right) \\ \longrightarrow & И \vec{y} \left(\mathcal{T}\left\{ \left(P \parallel \hat{U}^i \right) \mathbin{;} \left(Q \parallel \hat{V}^i \right) \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \right\} \right) \longrightarrow И \vec{y} (\mathcal{T}\{ \mathrm{I} \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{I} \end{array}$$

By Lemma 26, $\left| \hat{W} \right| \leq |R|$; hence $\left| И \vec{y}\,(P \mathbin{;} Q) \parallel \hat{W} \right| \prec \left| И x И \vec{y}\,(P \mathbin{;} Q) \parallel R \right|$ since the *new count* strictly decreases, as required.

Consider the fourth principal case for *new* where the bottommost rule of a proof is the *new wen* rule of the form $И x И \vec{z} \Im y P \parallel Q \longrightarrow И \vec{z} \Im y И x P \parallel Q$ where $\vdash И \vec{z} \Im y И x P \parallel Q$. By applying the induction hypothesis repeatedly, there exist $\vec{w}$ and $\hat{Q}$ such that $\vec{w} \subseteq \vec{z}$ and $\vec{z} \# \Im \vec{w} \hat{Q}$ and $\vdash \Im y И x P \parallel \hat{Q}$, and also $Q \longrightarrow \Im \vec{w} \hat{Q}$. Furthermore, the size of the proof of $\Im y И x P \parallel \hat{Q}$ is bounded above by the size of the proof of $И \vec{z} \Im y И x P \parallel Q$.

By the induction hypothesis, there exist R and S such that $x \# R$ and $\vdash И x P \parallel S$ and either $R = S$ or $R = И y S$, and also $\hat{Q} \longrightarrow R$. Furthermore, the size of the proof of $И x P \parallel S$ is bounded above by the size of the proof of $\Im y И x P \parallel Q$, hence strictly bounded above by the size of the proof of

$\mathsf{И}x\mathsf{Э}yP \parallel Q$ enabling the induction hypothesis. By the induction hypothesis again, there exist U and V such that $x \# U$ and $\vdash P \parallel V$ and either $U = V$ or $U = \mathsf{Э}xV$, and also $S \longrightarrow U$.

Let W and $\hat{W}$ be defined such that, if $R = \mathsf{И}yS$, then $\hat{W} = \mathsf{И}yV$; or, if $R = S$, then $\hat{W} = V$. If $V = U$ then define $W = \mathsf{Э}\vec{w}\hat{W}$. If $U = \mathsf{Э}xV$, then define $W = \mathsf{Э}x\mathsf{Э}\vec{w}\hat{W}$.

There are four scenarios for $\mathsf{Э}\vec{w}R \longrightarrow W$. In the case $V = U$ and $R = \mathsf{И}yS$ then $\mathsf{Э}\vec{w}\mathsf{И}yU = W$. If $V = U$ and $R = S$ then $\mathsf{Э}\vec{w}U = W$. If both $U = \mathsf{Э}xV$ and $R = \mathsf{И}yS$ then $\mathsf{Э}\vec{w}R = \mathsf{Э}\vec{w}\mathsf{И}yS \longrightarrow \mathsf{Э}\vec{w}\mathsf{И}yU = \mathsf{Э}\vec{w}\mathsf{И}y\mathsf{Э}xV \longrightarrow \mathsf{Э}x\mathsf{Э}\vec{w}\mathsf{И}yV = W$. If both $U = \mathsf{Э}xV$ and $R = S$ then $\mathsf{Э}\vec{w}R = \mathsf{Э}\vec{w}S \longrightarrow \mathsf{Э}\vec{w}U = \mathsf{Э}\vec{w}\mathsf{Э}xV \equiv W$. Thereby, by applying one of the above cases the following derivation can be constructed. $\hat{Q} \longrightarrow \mathsf{Э}\vec{w}Q \longrightarrow \mathsf{Э}\vec{w}R \longrightarrow W$.

In the case that $\hat{W} = \mathsf{И}yV$, the derivation $\mathsf{Э}yP \parallel \mathsf{И}yV \longrightarrow \mathsf{И}y\,(P \parallel V)$ holds. In the case, $\hat{W} = V$ and $y \# V$ teh derivation $\mathsf{Э}yP \parallel \hat{W} \longrightarrow \mathsf{Э}y\,(P \parallel V) \longrightarrow \mathsf{И}y\,(P \parallel V)$ holds. Hence in either case the following proof can be constructed.

$$\mathsf{И}\vec{z}\mathsf{Э}yP \parallel \mathsf{Э}\vec{w}\hat{W} \longrightarrow \mathsf{И}\vec{z}\big(\mathsf{Э}yP \parallel \hat{W}\big) \longrightarrow \mathsf{И}\vec{z}\mathsf{И}y\,(P \parallel V) \longrightarrow \mathsf{И}\vec{z}\mathsf{И}y\mathbf{1} \longrightarrow \mathbf{1}$$

Furthermore, by Lemma 26, $\big|\mathsf{Э}\vec{w}\hat{W}\big| \leq |Q|$. Hence $\big|\mathsf{Э}yP \parallel \mathsf{Э}\vec{w}\hat{W}\big| \prec \big|\mathsf{И}x\mathsf{И}\vec{z}\mathsf{Э}yP \parallel Q\big|$ since the *new* count strictly decreases.

Principal cases for seq. There are four principal cases for *seq*.

Consider the first principal case for *seq* composition. The difficulty in this case is that, due to associativity of sequential composition, the *sequence* rule may be applied in several ways when there are multiple sequential compositions. Consider a principal predicate of the form $(T_0 \,;\, T_1) \,;\, T_2$, where we aim to split the formula around the second sequential composition. The difficulty is that the bottommost rule may be an instance of the *sequence* rule applied between T_0 and $T_1 \,;\, T_2$. Symmetrically, the principal formula may be of the form $T_0 \,;\, (T_1 \,;\, T_2)$ but the bottommost rule may be an instance of the *sequence* rule applied between $T_0 \,;\, T_1$ and T_2. In the following analysis, only the former case is considered. The symmetric case follows the same pattern.

Consider when the principal predicate is of the form $(T_0 \,;\, T_1) \,;\, T_2$ and the bottommost rule in a proof is of the following form, where $T_0 \not\equiv \mathbf{1}$, $T_2 \not\equiv \mathbf{1}$, otherwise splitting is trivial, and either $U \not\equiv \mathbf{1}$ or $V \not\equiv \mathbf{1}$ otherwise the *sequence* rule cannot be applied:

$$(T_0 \,;\, T_1 \,;\, T_2) \parallel (U \,;\, V) \parallel W \longrightarrow ((T_0 \parallel U) \,;\, ((T_1 \,;\, T_2) \parallel V)) \parallel W$$

such that $\vdash ((T_0 \parallel U) \,;\, ((T_1 \,;\, T_2) \parallel V)) \parallel W$. By the induction hypothesis, there exist P_i and Q_i such that $\vdash T_0 \parallel U \parallel P_i$ and $\vdash (T_1 \,;\, T_2) \parallel V \parallel Q_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and an n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that $W \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\, P_1 \,;\, Q_1, \ldots, P_n \,;\, Q_n \,\}$. Furthermore the size of the proof of $(T_1 \,;\, T_2) \parallel V \parallel Q_i$ is bounded above by the size of the proof of $((T_0 \parallel U) \,;\, ((T_1 \,;\, T_2) \parallel V)) \parallel W$, hence the induction hypothesis is enabled.

By the induction hypothesis, there exists R^i_j and S^i_j such that $\vdash T_1 \parallel R^i_j$ and $\vdash T_2 \parallel S^i_j$, for $1 \leq j \leq m_i$, and m_i-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}^i\{\ \}$ such that the following derivation holds.

$$V \parallel Q_i \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^i\Big\{\, R^i_1 \,;\, S^i_1, \ldots, R^i_{m_i} \,;\, S^i_{m_i} \,\Big\}$$

Furthermore, by Lemma 14 there exist killing contexts $\mathcal{T}^i_0\{\ \}$ and $\mathcal{T}^i_1\{\ \}$ and sets of integers $J \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $K \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that.

$$\mathcal{T}^i\Big\{\, R^i_1 \,;\, S^i_1, \ldots, R^i_{m_i} \,;\, S^i_{m_i} \,\Big\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^i_0\Big\{\, R^i_j \colon j \in J \,\Big\} \,;\, \mathcal{T}^i_1\Big\{\, S^i_k \colon k \in K \,\Big\}$$

Thereby, the following derivation can be constructed.

$$\begin{aligned}(U \mathbin{;} V) \parallel W \quad &\longrightarrow (U \mathbin{;} V) \parallel \mathcal{T}\{\, P_1 \mathbin{;} Q_1, \ldots, P_n \mathbin{;} Q_n \,\} \\ &\longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\, (U \mathbin{;} V) \parallel (P_1 \mathbin{;} Q_1), \ldots, (U \mathbin{;} V) \parallel (P_n \mathbin{;} Q_n) \,\} \\ &\longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\, (U \parallel P_1) \mathbin{;} (V \parallel Q_1), \ldots, (U \parallel P_n) \mathbin{;} (V \parallel Q_n) \,\} \\ &\longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\Big\{\, (U \parallel P_1) \mathbin{;} \mathcal{T}^i\Big\{\, R^i_j \mathbin{;} S^i_j \colon 1 \le j \le m_i \,\Big\} : 1 \le i \le n \,\Big\} \\ &\longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\Big\{\, (U \parallel P_1) \mathbin{;} \mathcal{T}^i_0\Big\{\, R^i_j \colon j \in J \,\Big\} \mathbin{;} \mathcal{T}^i_1\Big\{\, S^i_k \colon k \in K \,\Big\} : 1 \le i \le n \,\Big\}\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the following proofs can be constructed.

$$T_2 \parallel \mathcal{T}^i\Big\{\, S^i_j \colon 1 \le j \le m_i \,\Big\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^i\Big\{\, T_2 \parallel S^i_j \colon 1 \le j \le m_i \,\Big\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^i\{\, \mathrm{I} \colon 1 \le j \le m_i \,\} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(T_0 \mathbin{;} T_1) \parallel \Big((U \parallel P_i) \mathbin{;} \mathcal{T}^i\Big\{\, R^i_j \colon 1 \le j \le m_i \,\Big\}\Big) \\ \longrightarrow \quad (T_0 \parallel U \parallel P_i) \mathbin{;} \Big(T_1 \parallel \mathcal{T}^i\Big\{\, R^i_j \colon 1 \le j \le m_i \,\Big\}\Big) \\ \longrightarrow \quad T_1 \parallel \mathcal{T}^i\Big\{\, R^i_j \colon 1 \le j \le m_i \,\Big\} \\ \longrightarrow \quad \mathcal{T}^i\Big\{\, T_1 \parallel R^i_j \colon 1 \le j \le m_i \,\Big\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^i\{\, \mathrm{I} \colon 1 \le j \le m_i \,\} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 26, $\Big|\mathcal{T}\Big\{\, (U \parallel P_1) \mathbin{;} \mathcal{T}^i_0\Big\{\, R^i_j \colon j \in J \,\Big\} \mathbin{;} \mathcal{T}^i_1\Big\{\, S^i_k \colon k \in K \,\Big\} : 1 \le i \le n \,\Big\}\Big| \le |(U \mathbin{;} V) \parallel W|$ which are also upper bounds for $\Big|\mathcal{T}^i_0\Big\{\, R^i_j \colon j \in J \,\Big\}\Big|$ and $\Big|\mathcal{T}^i_1\Big\{\, S^i_k \colon k \in K \,\Big\}\Big|$. Furthermore, $T_0 \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ and $T_2 \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ both $|T_0|_{occ} \sqsubset |T_0 \mathbin{;} T_1 \mathbin{;} T_2|_{occ}$ and $|T_2|_{occ} \sqsubset |T_0 \mathbin{;} T_1 \mathbin{;} T_2|_{occ}$ Hence the sizes of the above two proofs are strictly less than $|(T_0 \mathbin{;} T_1 \mathbin{;} T_2) \parallel (U \mathbin{;} V) \parallel W|$.

There are three similar principal case for *seq* that do not correspond to cases in MAV [23], induced by the *medial wen*, *left wen* and *right wen* rules. We present here only the case induced by *medial wen*. Consider the case where the bottommost rule of a proof is a *medial wen* rule that interferes with the *seq* connective to which splitting is applied as follows.

$$(P_0 \mathbin{;} \Im x P_1 \mathbin{;} \Im x P_2 \mathbin{;} P_3) \parallel Q \longrightarrow (P_0 \mathbin{;} \Im x (P_1 \mathbin{;} P_2) \mathbin{;} P_3) \parallel Q$$

In the above, it is assumed that $\vdash (P_0 \mathbin{;} \Im x (P_1 \mathbin{;} P_2) \mathbin{;} P_3) \parallel Q$. Hence, by induction, there exist U^0_i and U^1_i such that $\vdash P_0 \parallel U^0_i$ and $\vdash (\Im x (P_1 \mathbin{;} P_2) \mathbin{;} P_3) \parallel U^1_i$, for $1 \le i \le n$, and n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that the following derivation holds. $Q \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\Big\{\, U^0_i \mathbin{;} U^1_i \colon 1 \le i \le n \,\Big\}$. Furthermore the size of the proof of $(\Im x (P_1 \mathbin{;} P_2) \mathbin{;} P_3) \parallel U^1_i$ is bounded by the size of the proof of $(P_0 \mathbin{;} \Im x P_1 \mathbin{;} \Im x P_2 \mathbin{;} P_3) \parallel Q$.

By induction again, there exist V^i_j and W^i_j such that $\vdash \Im x (P_1 \mathbin{;} P_2) \parallel V^i_j$ and $\vdash P_3 \parallel W^i_j$, for $1 \le j \le m_i$, and m_i-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}^i\{\ \}$ such that the following derivation holds. $U^1_i \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^i\Big\{\, V^i_j \mathbin{;} W^i_j \colon 1 \le j \le m_i \,\Big\}$. Furthermore, the size of the proof of $\Im x (P_1 \mathbin{;} P_2) \parallel V^i_j$ is bounded by the size of the proof of $(\Im x (P_1 \mathbin{;} P_2) \mathbin{;} P_3) \parallel U^1_i$.

By applying the induction hypothesis again, there exist R^i_j and $\hat{R}^i_j$ such that $x \# R^i_j$ and $\vdash (P_1 \mathbin{;} P_2) \parallel \hat{R}^i_j$ and either $R^i_j = \hat{R}^i_j$ or $R^i_j = \mathit{\Pi} x \hat{R}^i_j$, and also $V^i_j \longrightarrow R^i_j$. Furthermore, the size of the proof of $(P_1 \mathbin{;} P_2) \parallel \hat{R}^i_j$ is bounded above by the size of the proof of $(\Im x (P_1 \mathbin{;} P_2) \mathbin{;} P_3) \parallel U^1_i$.

By a fourth induction, there exist $S^{i,j}_k$ and $T^{i,j}_k$ such that $\vdash P_1 \parallel S^{i,j}_k$ and $\vdash P_2 \parallel T^{i,j}_k$, for $1 \le k \le \ell^{i,j}$, and $\ell^{i,j}$-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}^{i,j}\{\ \}$ such that the following derivation holds.

$$\hat{R}^i_j \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^{i,j}\Big\{\, S^{i,j}_1 \mathbin{;} T^{i,j}_1, S^{i,j}_2 \mathbin{;} T^{i,j}_2, \ldots, S^{i,j}_{\ell^{i,j}} \mathbin{;} T^{i,j}_{\ell^{i,j}} \,\Big\}$$

Lemma 14, the following derivation holds, where $I^i_j \subseteq \Big\{1 \ldots \ell^{i,j}\Big\}$ and $J^i_j \subseteq \Big\{1 \ldots \ell^{i,j}\Big\}$ and killing contexts $\mathcal{T}^{i,j}_0\{\ \}$ and $\mathcal{T}^{i,j}_1\{\ \}$.

$$\hat{R}^i_j \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^{i,j}\Big\{\, S^{i,j}_k \mathbin{;} T^{i,j}_k \colon 1 \le k \le \ell^{i,j} \,\Big\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_0\Big\{\, S^{i,j}_k \colon k \in I^i_j \,\Big\} \mathbin{;} \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_1\Big\{\, T^{i,j}_k \colon k \in J^i_j \,\Big\}$$

Define the predicates $\hat{S}^i_j$ and $\hat{T}^i_j$ as follows.

- If $R^i_j = \hat{R}^i_j$, then define $\hat{S}^{\,i}_j = \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_0\{\, S^{i,j}_k : k \in I^i_j \,\}$ and $\hat{T}^i_j = \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_1\{\, T^{i,j}_k : k \in J^i_j \,\}$. Hence, $R^i_j \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_0\{\, S^{i,j}_k : k \in I^i_j \,\} ; \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_1\{\, T^{i,j}_k : k \in J^i_j \,\} = \hat{S}^{\,i}_j ; \hat{T}^i_j$.
- If $R^i_j = \nu x \hat{R}^i_j$, then define $\hat{S}^{\,i}_j = \nu x \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_0\{\, S^{i,j}_k : k \in I^i_j \,\}$ and $\hat{T}^i_j = \nu x \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_1\{\, T^{i,j}_k : k \in J^i_j \,\}$. Hence $R^i_j \longrightarrow \nu x \big(\mathcal{T}^{i,j}_0\{\, S^{i,j}_k : k \in I^i_j \,\} ; \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_1\{\, T^{i,j}_k : k \in J^i_j \,\}\big) \longrightarrow \hat{S}^{\,i}_j ; \hat{T}^i_j$.

Applying Lemma 14 again, for some $K^i \subseteq \{1 \dots m_i\}$ and $L^i \subseteq \{1 \dots m_i\}$ and killing contexts $\mathcal{T}^i_0\{\ \}$ and $\mathcal{T}^i_1\{\ \}$, there exists the following derivation.

$$\mathcal{T}^i\{\, \hat{S}^{\,i}_j ; \hat{T}^i_j ; W^i_j : 1 \le j \le m_i \,\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^i_0\{\, \hat{S}^{\,i}_j : j \in K^i \,\} ; \mathcal{T}^i_1\{\, \hat{T}^i_j ; W^i_j : j \in L^i \,\}$$

By using the above derivations we can construct the following derivation.

$$\begin{array}{rl}
Q \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\{\, U^0_i ; U^1_i : 1 \le i \le n \,\} \\
\longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\{\, U^0_i ; \mathcal{T}^i\{\, V^i_j ; W^i_j : 1 \le j \le m_i \,\} : 1 \le i \le n \,\} \\
\longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\{\, U^0_i ; \mathcal{T}^i\{\, R^i_j ; W^i_j : 1 \le j \le m_i \,\} : 1 \le i \le n \,\} \\
\longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\{\, U^0_i ; \mathcal{T}^i\{\, \hat{S}^{\,i}_j ; \hat{T}^i_j ; W^i_j : 1 \le j \le m_i \,\} : 1 \le i \le n \,\} \\
\longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\{\, U^0_i ; \mathcal{T}^i_0\{\, \hat{S}^{\,i}_j : j \in K^i \,\} ; \mathcal{T}^i_1\{\, \hat{T}^i_j ; W^i_j : j \in L^i \,\} : 1 \le i \le n \,\}
\end{array}$$

Consider $\vdash \Im x P_1 \parallel \hat{S}^{\,i}_j$. If $\hat{S}^{\,i}_j = \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_0\{\, S^{i,j}_k : k \in I^i_j \,\}$, where $x \# \hat{S}^{\,i}_j$, $\Im x P_1 \parallel \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_0\{\, S^{i,j}_k : k \in I^i_j \,\} \longrightarrow \nu x P_1 \parallel \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_0\{\, S^{i,j}_k : k \in I^i_j \,\} \longrightarrow \nu x \big(P_1 \parallel \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_0\{\, S^{i,j}_k : k \in I^i_j \,\}\big)$. If $\hat{S}^{\,i}_j = \nu x \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_0\{\, S^{i,j}_k : k \in I^i_j \,\}$ then $\Im x P_1 \parallel \nu x \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_0\{\, S^{i,j}_k : k \in I^i_j \,\} \longrightarrow \nu x \big(P_1 \parallel \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_0\{\, S^{i,j}_k : k \in I^i_j \,\}\big)$. Thereby, by applying one of the above cases for each i and j, the following proof can be constructed.

$$\begin{array}{rl}
\Im x P_1 \parallel \hat{S}^{\,i}_j \longrightarrow & \nu x \big(P_1 \parallel \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_0\{\, S^{i,j}_k : k \in I^i_j \,\}\big) \\
\longrightarrow & \nu x \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_0\{\, P_1 \parallel S^{i,j}_k : k \in I^i_j \,\} \longrightarrow \nu x \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_0\{\, \mathbf{1} : k \in I^i_j \,\} \longrightarrow \mathbf{1}
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{rl}
(P_0 ; \Im x P_1) \parallel \big(U^0_i ; \mathcal{T}^i_0\{\, \hat{S}^{\,i}_j : j \in K^i \,\}\big) \longrightarrow & \big(P_0 \parallel U^0_i\big) ; \big(\Im x P_1 \parallel \mathcal{T}^i_0\{\, \hat{S}^{\,i}_j : j \in K^i \,\}\big) \\
\longrightarrow & \Im x P_1 \parallel \mathcal{T}^i_0\{\, \hat{S}^{\,i}_j : j \in K^i \,\} \\
\longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}^i_0\{\, \Im x P_1 \parallel \hat{S}^{\,i}_j : j \in K^i \,\} \\
\longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}^i_0\{\, \nu x \big(P_1 \parallel \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_0\{\, S^{i,j}_k : k \in I^i_j \,\}\big) : j \in K^i \,\} \\
\longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}^i_0\{\, \nu x \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_0\{\, P_1 \parallel S^{i,j}_k : k \in I^i_j \,\} : j \in K^i \,\} \\
\longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}^i_0\{\, \nu x \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_0\{\, \mathbf{1} : k \in I^i_j \,\} : j \in K^i \,\} \longrightarrow \mathbf{1}
\end{array}$$

Consider $\vdash \Im x P_2 \parallel \hat{T}^i_j$. If $\hat{T}^i_j = \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_1\{\, T^{i,j}_k : k \in J^i_j \,\}$, where $x \# \hat{T}^i_j$, $\Im x P_2 \parallel \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_1\{\, T^{i,j}_k : k \in J^i_j \,\} \longrightarrow \nu x P_2 \parallel \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_1\{\, T^{i,j}_k : k \in J^i_j \,\} \longrightarrow \nu x \big(P_2 \parallel \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_1\{\, T^{i,j}_k : k \in J^i_j \,\}\big)$. If $\hat{S}^{\,i}_j = \nu x \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_1\{\, T^{i,j}_k : k \in J^i_j \,\}$ then $\Im x P_2 \parallel \nu x \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_1\{\, T^{i,j}_k : k \in J^i_j \,\} \longrightarrow \nu x \big(P_2 \parallel \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_1\{\, T^{i,j}_k : k \in J^i_j \,\}\big)$. Thereby, by applying one of the above derivations for each i and j, the following proof can be constructed.

$$\begin{array}{rl}
(\Im x P_2 ; P_3) \parallel \big(\mathcal{T}^i_1\{\, \hat{T}^i_j ; W^i_j : j \in L^i \,\}\big) \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}^i_1\{\, (\Im x P_2 ; P_3) \parallel \big(\hat{T}^i_j ; W^i_j\big) : j \in L^i \,\} \\
\longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}^i_1\{\, \big(\Im x P_2 \parallel \hat{T}^i_j\big) ; \big(P_3 \parallel W^i_j\big) : j \in L^i \,\} \\
\longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}^i_1\{\, \Im x P_2 \parallel \hat{T}^i_j : j \in L^i \,\} \\
\longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}^i_1\{\, \nu x \big(P_2 \parallel \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_1\{\, T^{i,j}_k : k \in J^i_j \,\}\big) : j \in L^i \,\} \\
\longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}^i_1\{\, \nu x \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_1\{\, P_2 \parallel T^{i,j}_k : k \in J^i_j \,\} : j \in L^i \,\} \\
\longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}^i_1\{\, \nu x \mathcal{T}^{i,j}_1\{\, \mathbf{1} : k \in J^i_j \,\} : j \in L^i \,\} \longrightarrow \mathbf{1}
\end{array}$$

Furthermore, by Lemma 26, the following inequalities holds. $\big|U^0_i ; \mathcal{T}^i_0\{\, \hat{S}^{\,i}_j : j \in K^i \,\}\big| \le |Q|$ and $\big|\mathcal{T}^i_1\{\, \hat{T}^i_j ; W^i_j : j \in L^i \,\}\big| \le |Q|$. Hence, the size of predicates $\big|(P_0 ; \Im x P_1) \parallel \big(U^0_i ; \mathcal{T}^i_0\{\, \hat{S}^{\,i}_j : j \in K^i \,\}\big)\big|$ and $\big|(\Im x P_2 ; P_3) \parallel \big(\mathcal{T}^i_1\{\, \hat{T}^i_j ; W^i_j : j \in L^i \,\}\big)\big|$ are strictly bounded above by $|(P_0 ; \Im x P_1 ; \Im x P_2 ; P_3) \parallel Q|$, as required.

Principal case for times. There is only one principal case for *times* that does not differ significantly from the corresponding case in existing calculi. The principal case, when times is actively involved in the bottommost rule, is a proof that begins as follows, where $T_0 \otimes U_0 \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ and also $V \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$, otherwise the *switch* rule cannot be applied, and also $T_0 \otimes T_1 \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ and $U_0 \otimes U_1 \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ otherwise splitting follows by a trivial equivalence: $(T_0 \otimes T_1 \otimes U_0 \otimes U_1) \parr V \parr W \longrightarrow (T_0 \otimes U_0 \otimes ((T_1 \otimes U_1) \parr V)) \parr W$ such that $\vdash (T_0 \otimes U_0 \otimes ((T_1 \otimes U_1) \parr V)) \parr W$.

By the induction hypothesis, there exist R_i and S_i such that $\vdash (T_0 \otimes U_0) \parr R_i$ and $\vdash (T_1 \otimes U_1) \parr V \parr S_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and an n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that the following holds.

$$W \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\, R_1 \parr S_1, \ldots, R_n \parr S_n \,\}$$

Furthermore $|(T_0 \otimes U_0) \parr R_i|$ and $|(T_1 \otimes U_1) \parr V \parr S_i|$ are bounded above by $|(T_0 \otimes U_0 \otimes ((T_1 \otimes U_1) \parr V)) \parr W|$.

Hence, by the induction hypothesis twice more there exist predicates $P_j^{i,0}$, $Q_j^{i,0}$, $P_k^{i,1}$ and $Q_k^{i,1}$ such that $\vdash T_0 \parr P_j^{i,0}$, $\vdash U_0 \parr Q_j^{i,0}$, $\vdash T_1 \parr P_k^{i,1}$ and $\vdash U_1 \parr Q_k^{i,1}$, for $1 \leq j \leq m_i^0$ and $1 \leq k \leq m_i^1$, and m_i^0-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}_i^0\{\ \}$ and m_i^1-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}_i^1\{\ \}$ such that the following derivations hold.

$$R_i \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}_i^0\Big\{\, P_j^{i,0} \parr Q_j^{i,0} \colon 1 \leq j \leq m_i^0 \,\Big\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad V \parr S_i \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}_i^1\Big\{\, P_k^{i,1} \parr Q_k^{i,1} \colon 1 \leq k \leq m_i^1 \,\Big\}$$

Thereby the following derivation can be constructed.

$$\begin{aligned}
V \parr W &\longrightarrow V \parr \mathcal{T}\{\, R_i \parr S_i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \,\} \\
&\longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\, R_i \parr V \parr S_i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \,\} \\
&\longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\Big\{\, \mathcal{T}_i^0\Big\{\, P_j^{i,0} \parr Q_j^{i,0} \colon 1 \leq j \leq m_i^0 \,\Big\} \parr \mathcal{T}_i^1\Big\{\, P_k^{i,1} \parr Q_k^{i,1} \colon 1 \leq k \leq m_i^1 \,\Big\} \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \,\Big\} \\
&\longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\Big\{\, \mathcal{T}_i^1\Big\{\, \mathcal{T}_i^0\Big\{\, P_j^{i,0} \parr Q_j^{i,0} \colon 1 \leq j \leq m_i^0 \,\Big\} \parr P_k^{i,1} \parr Q_k^{i,1} \colon 1 \leq k \leq m_i^1 \,\Big\} \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \,\Big\} \\
&\longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\Big\{\, \mathcal{T}_i^1\Big\{\, \mathcal{T}_i^0\Big\{\, P_j^{i,0} \parr P_k^{i,1} \parr Q_j^{i,0} \parr Q_k^{i,1} \colon 1 \leq j \leq m_i^0 \,\Big\} \colon 1 \leq k \leq m_i^1 \,\Big\} \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \,\Big\}
\end{aligned}$$

Now observe that the following proofs can be constructed.

$$(T_0 \otimes T_1) \parr P_j^{i,0} \parr P_k^{i,1} \longrightarrow \Big(T_0 \parr P_j^{i,0}\Big) \otimes \Big(T_1 \parr P_k^{i,1}\Big) \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$$

$$(U_0 \otimes U_1) \parr Q_j^{i,0} \parr Q_k^{i,1} \longrightarrow \Big(U_0 \parr Q_j^{i,0}\Big) \otimes \Big(U_1 \parr Q_k^{i,1}\Big) \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$$

Furthermore, since $T_0 \otimes T_1 \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ and $U_0 \otimes U_1 \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$, we have that $|T_0 \otimes T_1|_{occ} \sqsubset |T_0 \otimes T_1 \otimes U_0 \otimes U_1|_{occ}$ and $|U_0 \otimes U_1|_{occ} \sqsubset |T_0 \otimes T_1 \otimes U_0 \otimes U_1|_{occ}$. Also, by Lemma 26, the following inequality holds.

$$\Big|\mathcal{T}\Big\{\, \mathcal{T}_i^1\Big\{\, \mathcal{T}_i^0\Big\{\, P_j^{i,0} \parr P_k^{i,1} \parr Q_j^{i,0} \parr Q_k^{i,1} \colon 1 \leq j \leq m_i^0 \,\Big\} \colon 1 \leq k \leq m_i^1 \,\Big\} \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \,\Big\}\Big| \leq |V \parr W|$$

Hence both $\Big|P_j^{i,0} \parr P_k^{i,1}\Big| \leq |V \parr W|$ and $\Big|Q_j^{i,0} \parr Q_k^{i,1}\Big| \leq |V \parr W|$ hold. Thereby the size of each of the above proofs is strictly bounded above by the size of the proof of $(T_0 \otimes T_1 \otimes U_0 \otimes U_1) \parr V \parr W$, as required.

Commutative cases involving equivarance. As in every splitting lemma, there are commutative cases for *new*, *wen*, *all*, *with*, *seq* and *times*. There is one form of commutative case for *new* that does not appear in other splitting lemmas. The *equivariance* rule induces the following case where the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form, $\exists x \exists y P \parr \forall y Q \parr R \longrightarrow \forall y\, (\exists x P \parr Q) \parr R$ where $\vdash \forall y\, (\exists x P \parr Q) \parr R$ and both $y \# R$ and $x \# R$. Notice that $\exists x \ldots$ is the principal connective but the *close* rule is applied to $\exists y \ldots$ behind the principal connective.

By induction, there exist S and T such that $y \# S$ and $\vdash \exists x P \parr Q \parr T$ and either $S = T$ or $S = \exists y T$ and the derivation $R \longrightarrow S$ holds. Furthermore the size of the proof of $\exists x P \parr Q \parr T$ is bounded above by the size of the proof of $\forall y\, (\exists x P \parr Q) \parr R$; hence strictly bounded by the size of

the proof of $\exists x \exists y P \parallel \forall y Q \parallel R$. Hence, by induction, there exist U and V such that $\vdash P \parallel V$ and $x \# U$ and either $U = V$ or $U = \forall x V$ the derivation $Q \parallel T \longrightarrow U$ holds. Observe that if $S = T$, then $\forall y Q \parallel S \longrightarrow \forall y (Q \parallel T)$, since $y \# S$. If $S = \exists y T$ then $\forall y Q \parallel \exists y T \longrightarrow \forall y (Q \parallel T)$. Thereby the following derivation can be constructed, where if $U = V$ then $W = \forall y V$ and if $U = \forall x V$ then $W = \forall x \forall y V$. $\forall y Q \parallel R \longrightarrow \forall y Q \parallel S \longrightarrow \forall y (Q \parallel T) \longrightarrow \forall y U \equiv W$. Furthermore, the following proof can be constructed $\exists y P \parallel \forall y V \longrightarrow \exists y (P \parallel V) \longrightarrow \forall y \mathrm{I}$ and, by Lemma 26, $|\forall y V| \preceq |\forall y Q \parallel R|$ hence $|\exists y P \parallel \forall y V| \prec |\exists x \exists y P \parallel \forall y Q \parallel R|$, as required.

A similar commutative case for *wen* is induced where the bottommost rule in a proof is of the form $\exists x \exists y P \parallel Q \parallel R \longrightarrow \exists y (\exists x P \parallel Q) \parallel R$ where $y \# Q$ and $\vdash \exists y (\exists x P \parallel Q) \parallel R$. By the induction hypothesis, there exist S and T such that $y \# S$ and $\vdash \exists x P \parallel Q \parallel T$ and either $S = T$ or $S = \forall y T$ such that $R \longrightarrow S$. Furthermore, the size of the proof of $\exists x P \parallel Q \parallel T$ is bounded by the size of the proof of $\exists y (\exists x P \parallel Q) \parallel R$ hence strictly bounded by the size of the proof of $\exists x \exists y P \parallel Q \parallel R$. Hence, by the induction hypothesis again, there exist U and V such that $x \# U$ and $\vdash P \parallel V$ and either $U = V$ or $U = \forall x V$, and derivation $Q \parallel T \longrightarrow U$ holds.

If $S = \forall y T$ let $\hat{W} = \forall y V$ otherwise $\hat{W} = V$. If $U = \forall x V$ let $W = \forall x \hat{W}$, otherwise $W = \hat{W}$. Thereby the following derivations hold:

- If $S = \forall y T$ and $U = \forall x V$ then $Q \parallel S \longrightarrow \forall y (Q \parallel T) \longrightarrow \forall y U \equiv W$.
- If $S = \forall y T$ and $U = V$ then $Q \parallel S \longrightarrow \forall y (Q \parallel T) \longrightarrow \forall y U \equiv W$.
- If $S = T$ then $Q \parallel S = Q \parallel T \longrightarrow U \equiv W$.

Hence in any of the above cases, $Q \parallel R \longrightarrow Q \parallel S \longrightarrow W$. Now, if $\hat{W} = \forall y V$, then $\exists y P \parallel \hat{W} \longrightarrow \forall y (P \parallel V)$; and if $\hat{W} = V$ then $S = T$, hence $\exists y P \parallel \hat{W} \longrightarrow \exists y (P \parallel V)$, since $y \# V$. In either case is provable since $\exists y (P \parallel V) \longrightarrow \forall y \mathrm{I} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$. Furthermore, $\left|\exists y P \parallel \hat{W}\right| \prec |\exists x \exists y P \parallel Q \parallel R|$, since by Lemma 26 $\left|\hat{W}\right| \preceq |Q \parallel R|$.

The third commutative case for *wen* induced by equivariance is where the bottommost rule is of the form $\exists x \exists y P \parallel \exists y Q \parallel R \longrightarrow \exists y (\exists x P \parallel Q) \parallel R$, where $\vdash \exists y (\exists x P \parallel Q) \parallel R$. By the induction hypothesis, there exist S and T where $y \# S$ and $\vdash \exists x P \parallel Q \parallel T$ and either $S = T$ or $S = \forall y T$ such that $R \longrightarrow S$. Furthermore, the size of the proof of $\exists x P \parallel Q \parallel T$ is bounded above by the size of the proof of $\exists y (\exists x P \parallel Q) \parallel R$, hence strictly bounded above by the size of the proof of $\exists x \exists y P \parallel \exists y Q \parallel R$. Hence by the induction hypothesis again, there exist U and V where $x \# U$ and $\vdash P \parallel V$ and either $U = V$ or $U = \forall x V$, such that $Q \parallel T \longrightarrow U$.

Let if $U = V$ then let $W = \forall y V$, and if $U = \forall x V$ then let $W = \forall x \forall y V$. Also observe that whether $S = T$ or $S = \forall y T$, $\exists y Q \parallel S \longrightarrow \exists y (Q \parallel T)$. Thereby the following derivation can be constructed: $\exists y Q \parallel R \longrightarrow \exists y (Q \parallel T) \longrightarrow \exists y U \equiv W \longrightarrow \forall y U \equiv W$. Furthermore, the following proof can be constructed $\exists y P \parallel \forall y V \longrightarrow \forall y (P \parallel V) \longrightarrow \forall y \mathrm{I} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$; and the size of the proof of $|\exists y P \parallel \forall y V| \prec |\exists x \exists y P \parallel \exists y Q \parallel R|$, since $|\forall y V| \preceq |\exists y Q \parallel R|$ by Lemma 26.

Consider the first commutative case for *new* induced by equivariance, where the bottommost rule is of the form $\forall x \forall y P \parallel \exists y Q \parallel R \longrightarrow \forall y (\forall x P \parallel Q) \parallel R$, where $\vdash \forall y (\forall x P \parallel Q) \parallel R$. By the induction hypothesis, there exist S and T such that $y \# S$ and $\vdash \exists x P \parallel Q \parallel T$ and either $S = T$ or $S = \exists y T$, where $R \longrightarrow S$. Furthermore, the size of the proof of $\exists x P \parallel Q \parallel T$ is bound above by the size of the proof of $\forall y (\forall x P \parallel Q) \parallel R$, hence strictly bound above by the size of the proof of $\forall x \forall y P \parallel \exists y Q \parallel R$. Hence, by induction again, there exist U and V such that $x \# U$ and $\vdash P \parallel V$ and either $U = V$ or $U = \exists x V$, and also $Q \parallel T \longrightarrow U$.

If $U = V$ then let $W = \exists y V$, and if $U = \exists x V$ then let $W = \exists x \exists y V$. Also, regardless of whether $S = T$ or $S = \exists y T$, $\exists y Q \parallel S \longrightarrow \exists y (Q \parallel S)$. Hence the following derivation can be constructed: $\exists y Q \parallel R \longrightarrow \exists y Q \parallel S \longrightarrow \exists y (Q \parallel T) \longrightarrow \exists y U \equiv W$. Furthermore, $\forall y P \parallel \exists y V \longrightarrow \forall y (P \parallel V) \longrightarrow \forall y \mathrm{I} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$, and $|\forall y P \parallel \exists y V| \prec |\forall x \forall y P \parallel \exists y Q \parallel R|$, since by Lemma 26 $|\exists y V| \preceq |\exists y Q \parallel R|$.

Consider the second commutative case for *new* induced by equivariance, where the bottommost rule is of the form $\text{И}x\text{И}yP \parallel Q \parallel R \longrightarrow \text{И}y\,(\text{И}xP \parallel Q) \parallel R$, where $y \# Q$ and $\vdash \text{И}y\,(\text{И}xP \parallel Q) \parallel R$. By the induction hypothesis, there exist S and T such that $y \# S$ and $\vdash \Im xP \parallel Q \parallel T$ and either $S = T$ or $S = \Im yT$, where $R \longrightarrow S$. Furthermore, the size of the proof of $\Im xP \parallel Q \parallel T$ is bound above by the size of the proof of $\text{И}y\,(\text{И}xP \parallel Q) \parallel R$, hence strictly bound above by the size of the proof of $\text{И}x\text{И}yP \parallel Q \parallel R$. Hence, by induction again, there exist U and V such that $x \# U$ and $\vdash P \parallel V$ and either $U = V$ or $U = \Im xV$, and also $Q \parallel T \longrightarrow U$.

If $S = T$ then let $\hat{W} = V$, and if $S = \Im yY$ then let $\hat{W} = \Im yV$. If $U = V$ then let $W = \hat{W}$, and if $U = \Im xV$ then let $W = \Im x\hat{W}$. Also, regardless of whether $S = T$ or $S = \Im yT$, $\Im yQ \parallel S \longrightarrow \Im y\,(Q \parallel S)$. Hence the following derivation can be constructed: $\Im yQ \parallel R \longrightarrow \Im yQ \parallel S \longrightarrow \Im y\,(Q \parallel T) \longrightarrow \Im yU \equiv W$. Observe that, if $\hat{W} = \Im yV$ then $\text{И}yP \parallel \Im yV \longrightarrow \text{И}y\,(P \parallel V)$. If $\hat{W} = V$, then $S = T$, hence $\text{И}yP \parallel V \longrightarrow \text{И}y\,(P \parallel V)$, since $y \# V$. Thereby the following proof can be constructed: $\text{И}yP \parallel \hat{W} \longrightarrow \text{И}y\,(P \parallel V) \longrightarrow \text{И}y\,\text{I} \longrightarrow \text{I}$, and, furthermore, $\left|\text{И}yP \parallel \hat{W}\right| \prec |\text{И}x\text{И}yP \parallel \Im yQ \parallel R|$, since by Lemma 26 $\left|\hat{W}\right| \preceq |\Im yQ \parallel R|$.

Commutative cases involving nominals. Consider the case when the *new* quantifier commutes with a *wen* quantifier. In this case the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $\Im xP \parallel \text{И}yQ \parallel R \parallel S \longrightarrow \text{И}y\,(\Im xP \parallel Q \parallel R) \parallel S$, where $y \# \Im xP \parallel R$ and also $x \neq y$, where the second condition can be achieved by α-conversion.

By the induction hypothesis, there exist T and U such that $\vdash \Im xP \parallel Q \parallel R \parallel U$, $y \# T$ and either $T = U$ or $T = \Im yU$, and also $S \longrightarrow T$. Furthermore, the size of the proof of $\Im xP \parallel Q \parallel R \parallel U$ is bounded above by the size of the proof of $\text{И}y\,(\Im xP \parallel Q \parallel R) \parallel S$ and hence strictly bounded above by the size of the proof of $\Im xP \parallel \text{И}yQ \parallel R \parallel S$, enabling the induction hypothesis. Hence, by the induction hypothesis, there exist predicates V and $\hat{V}$ such that $\vdash P \parallel \hat{V}$ and $x \# V$ and either $V = \hat{V}$ or $V = \text{И}x\hat{V}$, and also $Q \parallel R \parallel U \longrightarrow V$.

Define W such that if $V = \hat{V}$ then $W = \text{И}y\hat{V}$ and if $V = \text{И}x\hat{V}$ then $W = \text{И}x\text{И}y\hat{V}$. Now observe that either $T = U$ and $y \# U$ hence $\text{И}yQ \parallel R \parallel T \longrightarrow \text{И}y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U)$; or $T = \Im yU$ hence $\text{И}yQ \parallel R \parallel \Im yU \longrightarrow \text{И}y\,(Q \parallel R) \parallel \Im yU \longrightarrow \text{И}y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U)$. Hence the following derivation can be constructed, by applying one of the above cases.

$$\begin{array}{rl} \text{И}yQ \parallel R \parallel S \longrightarrow & \text{И}yQ \parallel R \parallel T \\ \longrightarrow & \text{И}y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U) \longrightarrow \text{И}yV \equiv W \end{array}$$

Since $y \# \Im xP$ and $x \neq y$, we have $y \# P$; thereby the following proof can be constructed, $P \parallel \text{И}y\hat{V} \longrightarrow \text{И}y\left(P \parallel \hat{V}\right) \longrightarrow \text{И}y\,\text{I} \longrightarrow \text{I}$. Furthermore, $\left|P \parallel \text{И}y\hat{V}\right| \prec |\Im xP \parallel \text{И}yQ \parallel R \parallel S|$ since by Lemma 26 $\left|\text{И}y\hat{V}\right| \preceq \text{И}yQ \parallel R \parallel S$ and the *wen count* strictly decreases.

Consider the case when the *wen* quantifier commutes with another *wen* quantifier at the root of the principal predicate. In this case, the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $\Im xP \parallel \Im yQ \parallel R \parallel S \longrightarrow \Im y\,(\Im xP \parallel Q \parallel R) \parallel S$, where $y \# \Im xP \parallel R$ and $x \neq y$, where the second condition can be achieved by α-conversion. By the induction hypothesis, there exist T and U such that $\vdash \Im xP \parallel Q \parallel R \parallel U$, $y \# T$ and either $T = U$ or $T = \text{И}yU$, and also $S \longrightarrow T$. Furthermore, the size of the proof of $\Im xP \parallel Q \parallel R \parallel U$ is bounded above by the size of the proof of $\Im y\,(\Im xP \parallel Q \parallel R) \parallel S$ and hence strictly bounded above by the size of the proof of $\Im xP \parallel \Im yQ \parallel R \parallel S$, enabling the induction hypothesis. Hence, by the induction hypothesis, there exist predicates V and $\hat{V}$ such that $\vdash P \parallel \hat{V}$ and $x \# V$ and either $V = \hat{V}$ or $V = \text{И}x\hat{V}$, and also $Q \parallel R \parallel U \longrightarrow V$.

Define W such that if $V = \hat{V}$ then $W = \text{И}y\hat{V}$ and if $V = \text{И}x\hat{V}$ then $W = \text{И}x\text{И}y\hat{V}$. In either case, $x \# W$. Now observe that either $T = U$ and $y \# U$ hence $\Im yQ \parallel R \parallel T \longrightarrow \Im y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U) \longrightarrow \text{И}y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U)$; or $T = \text{И}yU$ hence $\Im yQ \parallel R \parallel \text{И}yU \longrightarrow \Im y\,(Q \parallel R) \parallel \text{И}yU \longrightarrow \text{И}y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U)$.

Hence the following derivation can be constructed, by applying one of the above cases.

$$\exists yQ \parallel R \parallel S \longrightarrow \exists yQ \parallel R \parallel T \longrightarrow \forall y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U_i) \longrightarrow \forall yV \equiv W$$

Since $y \# \exists xP$ and $x \neq y$ we have $y \# P$, hence the following proof can be constructed: $P \parallel \forall y\hat{V} \longrightarrow \forall y\left(P \parallel \hat{V}\right) \longrightarrow \forall y\mathbf{1} \longrightarrow \mathbf{1}$. Furthermore, $\left|P \parallel \forall y\hat{V}\right| \prec |\exists xP \parallel \forall yQ \parallel R \parallel S|$ since by Lemma 26 $\left|\forall y\hat{V}\right| \preceq \forall yQ \parallel R \parallel S$ and the *wen count* strictly decreases.

Consider the case when the *new* quantifier commutes with another *new* quantifier. In this case the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $\forall xP \parallel \forall yQ \parallel R \parallel S \longrightarrow \forall y\,(\forall xP \parallel Q \parallel R) \parallel S$, where $y \# \forall xP \parallel R$ and $x \neq y$, where the second case can be ensured by α-conversion. By induction, there exist T and U such that $\vdash \forall xP \parallel Q \parallel R \parallel U$, $y \# T$ and either $T = U$ or $T = \exists yU$, and also $S \longrightarrow T$.

Furthermore, the size of the proof of $\forall xP \parallel Q \parallel R \parallel U$ is bounded above by the size of the proof of $\forall y\,(\forall xP \parallel Q \parallel R) \parallel S$ and hence strictly bounded above by the size of the proof of $\forall xP \parallel \forall yQ \parallel R \parallel S$, enabling the induction hypothesis. Hence, by the induction hypothesis, there exist predicates V and $\hat{V}$ such that $\vdash P \parallel \hat{V}$ and $x \# V$ and either $V = \hat{V}$ or $V = \exists x\hat{V}$, and also $Q \parallel R \parallel U \longrightarrow V$.

Define W such that if $V = \hat{V}$ then $W = \forall y\hat{V}$ and if $V = \exists x\hat{V}$ then $W = \exists x\forall y\hat{V}$. Hence if $V = \exists x\hat{V}$ then $\forall yV = \forall yV\exists x\hat{V} \longrightarrow \forall yV\exists x\hat{V} = W$, by applying the *new wen* rule. If $V = \hat{V}$ then $\forall yV = W$. In both cases, $x \# W$. Now observe that either $T = U$ and $y \# U$ hence $\forall yQ \parallel R \parallel T \longrightarrow \forall y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U)$; or $T = \exists yU$ hence $\forall yQ \parallel R \parallel \exists yU \longrightarrow \forall y\,(Q \parallel R) \parallel \exists yU \longrightarrow \forall y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U)$. Hence the following derivation can be constructed, by applying the observations.

$$\forall yQ \parallel R \parallel S \longrightarrow \forall yQ \parallel R \parallel T \longrightarrow \forall y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U) \longrightarrow \forall yV \longrightarrow W$$

Since $y \# \forall xP \parallel R$ and $x \neq y$, we have $y \# P$; thereby the following proof can be constructed: $P \parallel \forall y\hat{V} \longrightarrow \forall y\left(P \parallel \hat{V}\right) \longrightarrow \forall y\mathbf{1} \longrightarrow \mathbf{1}$. Furthermore, $\left|P \parallel \forall y\hat{V}\right| \prec |\exists xP \parallel \forall yQ \parallel R \parallel S|$ since by Lemma 26 $\left|\forall y\hat{V}\right| \preceq \forall yQ \parallel R \parallel S$ and the *wen count* strictly decreases.

Consider the case when the *new* quantifier commutes with $P_0 \otimes P_1$ as the principal predicate. In this case the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $(P_0 \otimes P_1) \parallel \forall yQ \parallel R \parallel S \longrightarrow \forall y\,((P_0 \otimes P_1) \parallel Q \parallel R) \parallel S$. where $y \# (P_0 \otimes P_1) \parallel R$. By induction, there exist T and U such that $\vdash (P_0 \otimes P_1) \parallel Q \parallel R \parallel U$, $y \# T$ and either $T = U$ or $T = \exists yU$, and also $S \longrightarrow T$.

Furthermore, the size of the proof of $(P_0 \otimes P_1) \parallel Q \parallel R \parallel U$ is bounded above by the size of the proof of $\forall y\,((P_0 \otimes P_1) \parallel Q \parallel R) \parallel S$ and hence strictly bounded above by the size of the proof of $(P_0 \otimes P_1) \parallel \forall yQ \parallel R \parallel S$, enabling the induction hypothesis. Hence, by the induction hypothesis, there exist predicates V_i and W_i such that $\vdash P_0 \parallel V_i$ and $\vdash P_1 \parallel W_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and also n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that $Q \parallel R \parallel U \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ V_i \parallel W_i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n\ \}$. Furthermore, the size of the proofs of $P_0 \parallel V_i$ and $P_1 \parallel W_i$ are bounded above by the size of the proof of $(P_0 \otimes P_1) \parallel \forall yQ \parallel R \parallel S$.

Now observe that either $T = U$ and $y \# U$ hence $\forall yQ \parallel R \parallel T \longrightarrow \forall y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U)$; or $T = \exists yU$ hence $\forall yQ \parallel R \parallel \exists yU \longrightarrow \forall y\,(Q \parallel R) \parallel \exists yU \longrightarrow \forall y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U)$. Hence the following derivation can be constructed, by applying the above observation.

$$\forall yQ \parallel R \parallel S \longrightarrow \forall yQ \parallel R \parallel T \longrightarrow \forall y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U) \longrightarrow \forall y\mathcal{T}\{\ V_i \parallel W_i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n\ \}$$

Observe that $\forall y\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ is a n-ary killing context as required.

Consider the case when the *wen* quantifier commutes with $P_0 \otimes P_1$ as the principal predicate. In this case the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $(P_0 \otimes P_1) \parallel \exists yQ \parallel R \parallel S \longrightarrow \exists y\,((P_0 \otimes P_1) \parallel Q \parallel R) \parallel S$. where $y \# (P_0 \otimes P_1) \parallel R$. By induction, there exist T and U such that $\vdash (P_0 \otimes P_1) \parallel Q \parallel R \parallel U$, $y \# T$ and either $T = U$ or $T = \forall yU$, and also $S \longrightarrow T$.

Furthermore, the size of the proof of $(P_0 \otimes P_1) \parallel Q \parallel R \parallel U$ is bounded above by the size of the proof of $\Im y\,((P_0 \otimes P_1) \parallel Q \parallel R) \parallel S$ and hence strictly bounded above by the size of the proof of $(P_0 \otimes P_1) \parallel \Im yQ \parallel R \parallel S$, enabling the induction hypothesis. Hence, by the induction hypothesis, there exist predicates V_i and W_i such that $\vdash P_0 \parallel V_i$ and $\vdash P_1 \parallel W_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and also n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that $Q \parallel R \parallel U \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ V_i \parallel W_i \colon\ 1 \leq i \leq n\ \}$. Furthermore, the size of the proofs of $P_0 \parallel V_i$ and $P_1 \parallel W_i$ are bounded above by the size of the proof of $(P_0 \otimes P_1) \parallel \Im yQ \parallel R \parallel S$.

Now observe that either $T = U$ and $y \# U$ hence $\Im yQ \parallel R \parallel T \longrightarrow \Im y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U) \longrightarrow \mathit{И}y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U)$; or $T = \mathit{И}yU$ hence $\Im yQ \parallel R \parallel \mathit{И}yU \longrightarrow \Im y\,(Q \parallel R) \parallel \mathit{И}yU \longrightarrow \mathit{И}y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U)$. Hence the following derivation can be constructed, by applying the above observation.

$$\Im yQ \parallel R \parallel S \longrightarrow \Im yQ \parallel R \parallel T \longrightarrow \mathit{И}y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U) \longrightarrow \mathit{И}y\mathcal{T}\{\ V_i \parallel W_i \colon\ 1 \leq i \leq n\ \}$$

Observe that $\mathit{И}y\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ is a n-ary killing context as required.

Consider the case when the *new* quantifier commutes with $P_0\ ;\ P_1$ as the principal predicate. In this case the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $(P_0\ ;\ P_1) \parallel \mathit{И}yQ \parallel R \parallel S \longrightarrow \mathit{И}y\,((P_0\ ;\ P_1) \parallel Q \parallel R) \parallel S$. where $y \# (P_0\ ;\ P_1) \parallel R$. By induction, there exist T and U such that $\vdash (P_0\ ;\ P_1) \parallel Q \parallel R \parallel U$, $y \# T$ and either $T = U$ or $T = \Im yU$, and also $S \longrightarrow T$.

Furthermore, the size of the proof of $(P_0\ ;\ P_1) \parallel Q \parallel R \parallel U$ is bounded above by the size of the proof of $\mathit{И}y\,((P_0\ ;\ P_1) \parallel Q \parallel R) \parallel S$ and hence strictly bounded above by the size of the proof of $(P_0\ ;\ P_1) \parallel \mathit{И}yQ \parallel R \parallel S$, enabling the induction hypothesis. Hence, by the induction hypothesis, there exist predicates V_i and W_i such that $\vdash P_0 \parallel V_i$ and $\vdash P_1 \parallel W_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and also n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that $Q \parallel R \parallel U \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ V_i\ ;\ W_i \colon\ 1 \leq i \leq n\ \}$. Furthermore, the size of the proofs of $P_0 \parallel V_i$ and $P_1 \parallel W_i$ are bounded above by the size of the proof of $(P_0\ ;\ P_1) \parallel \mathit{И}yQ \parallel R \parallel S$.

Now observe that either $T = U$ and $y \# U$ hence $\mathit{И}yQ \parallel R \parallel T \longrightarrow \mathit{И}y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U)$; or $T = \Im yU$ hence $\mathit{И}yQ \parallel R \parallel \Im yU \longrightarrow \mathit{И}y\,(Q \parallel R) \parallel \Im yU \longrightarrow \mathit{И}y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U)$. Hence the following derivation can be constructed, by applying the above observation.

$$\mathit{И}yQ \parallel R \parallel S \longrightarrow \mathit{И}yQ \parallel R \parallel T \longrightarrow \mathit{И}y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U) \longrightarrow \mathit{И}y\mathcal{T}\{\ V_i\ ;\ W_i \colon\ 1 \leq i \leq n\ \}$$

Observe that $\mathit{И}y\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ is a n-ary killing context as required.

Consider the case when the *wen* quantifier commutes with $P_0\ ;\ P_1$ as the principal predicate. In this case the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $(P_0\ ;\ P_1) \parallel \Im yQ \parallel R \parallel S \longrightarrow \Im y\,((P_0\ ;\ P_1) \parallel Q \parallel R) \parallel S$. where $y \# (P_0\ ;\ P_1) \parallel R$. By induction, there exist T and U such that $\vdash (P_0\ ;\ P_1) \parallel Q \parallel R \parallel U$, $y \# T$ and either $T = U$ or $T = \mathit{И}yU$, and also $S \longrightarrow T$.

Furthermore, the size of the proof of $(P_0\ ;\ P_1) \parallel Q \parallel R \parallel U$ is bounded above by the size of the proof of $\Im y\,((P_0\ ;\ P_1) \parallel Q \parallel R) \parallel S$ and hence strictly bounded above by the size of the proof of $(P_0\ ;\ P_1) \parallel \Im yQ \parallel R \parallel S$, enabling the induction hypothesis. Hence, by the induction hypothesis, there exist predicates V_i and W_i such that $\vdash P_0 \parallel V_i$ and $\vdash P_1 \parallel W_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and also n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that $Q \parallel R \parallel U \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ V_i\ ;\ W_i \colon\ 1 \leq i \leq n\ \}$. Furthermore, the size of the proofs of $P_0 \parallel V_i$ and $P_1 \parallel W_i$ are bounded above by the size of the proof of $(P_0\ ;\ P_1) \parallel \Im yQ \parallel R \parallel S$.

Now observe that either $T = U$ and $y \# U$ hence $\Im yQ \parallel R \parallel T \longrightarrow \Im y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U) \longrightarrow \mathit{И}y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U)$; or $T = \mathit{И}yU$ hence $\Im yQ \parallel R \parallel \mathit{И}yU \longrightarrow \Im y\,(Q \parallel R) \parallel \mathit{И}yU \longrightarrow \mathit{И}y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U)$. Hence the following derivation can be constructed, by applying the above observation.

$$\Im yQ \parallel R \parallel S \longrightarrow \Im yQ \parallel R \parallel T \longrightarrow \mathit{И}y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U) \longrightarrow \mathit{И}y\mathcal{T}\{\ V_i\ ;\ W_i \colon\ 1 \leq i \leq n\ \}$$

Observe that $\mathit{И}y\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ is a n-ary killing context as required.

Consider the commutative case for *with* where $\Im xT$ is the principal predicate. The bottommost rule is the form $\Im xT \parallel (U\ \&\ V) \parallel W \parallel P \longrightarrow (\Im xT \parallel U \parallel W\ \&\ \Im xT \parallel V \parallel W) \parallel P$ where $\vdash$

$((\Im xT \parallel U \parallel W) \,\&\, (\Im xT \parallel V \parallel W)) \parallel P$ holds. By Lemma 10, $\vdash \Im xT \parallel U \parallel W \parallel P$ and $\vdash \Im xT \parallel V \parallel W \parallel P$; and furthermore the following two strict multiset inequalities hold: $|\Im xT \parallel U \parallel W \parallel P|_{occ} \sqsubset |\Im xT \parallel (U \,\&\, V) \parallel W \parallel P|_{occ}$ and $|\Im xT \parallel V \parallel W \parallel P|_{occ} \sqsubset |\Im xT \parallel (U \,\&\, V) \parallel W \parallel P|_{occ}$.

Hence, by the induction hypothesis, there exist Q and $\hat{Q}$ such that $\vdash T \parallel \hat{Q}$, $x \# Q$ and either $Q = \hat{Q}$ or $Q = \text{⅄}x\hat{Q}$, and R and $\hat{R}$ such that $\vdash T \parallel \hat{R}$, $x \# R$ and either $R = \hat{R}$ or $R = \text{⅄}x\hat{R}$, and also the two derivations $U \parallel W \parallel P \longrightarrow Q$ and $V \parallel W \parallel P \longrightarrow R$ hold.

Now define S such that if $Q = \hat{Q}$ and $R = \hat{R}$ then $S = \hat{Q} \,\&\, \hat{R}$, and $S = \Im x\left(\hat{Q} \,\&\, \hat{R}\right)$ otherwise. Observe that in either case $x \# S$. In the case $Q = \Im x\hat{Q}$ and $R = \Im x\hat{R}$, since quantifiers distribute over *with*, $\Im x\hat{Q} \,\&\, \Im x\hat{R} \longrightarrow \Im x\left(\hat{Q} \,\&\, \hat{R}\right)$. In the case $Q = \Im x\hat{Q}$ and $R = \hat{R}$, since quantifiers extrude over *with*, $\Im x\hat{Q} \,\&\, \hat{R} \longrightarrow \Im x\left(\hat{Q} \,\&\, \hat{R}\right)$. In the case $Q = \hat{Q}$ and $R = \Im x\hat{R}$, since quantifiers extrude over *with*, $\hat{Q} \,\&\, \Im x\hat{R} \longrightarrow \Im x\left(\hat{Q} \,\&\, \hat{R}\right)$.

Thereby the following derivation can be constructed.

$$(U \,\&\, V) \parallel W \parallel P \longrightarrow (U \parallel W \parallel P) \,\&\, (V \parallel W \parallel P) \longrightarrow Q \,\&\, R \longrightarrow S$$

Also the following proof can be constructed.

$$T \parallel \left(\hat{Q} \,\&\, \hat{R}\right) \longrightarrow \left(T \parallel \hat{Q}\right) \,\&\, \left(T \parallel \hat{R}\right) \longrightarrow \text{I} \,\&\, \text{I} \longrightarrow \text{I}$$

Furthermore, by Lemma 26, $|S| \preceq |(U \,\&\, V) \parallel W \parallel P|$; hence, since the *wen* count strictly decreases, $\left|T \parallel \hat{Q} \,\&\, \hat{R}\right| \prec \Im xT \parallel (U \,\&\, V) \parallel W \parallel P$.

Consider the case where universal quantification commutes with *wen* as the principal predicate. In this case, the bottommost rule is of the form $\Im xT \parallel \forall yU \parallel V \parallel W \longrightarrow \forall y\,(\Im xT \parallel U \parallel V) \parallel W$, assuming $y \# (\Im xT \parallel V)$ where $\vdash \forall y\,(\Im xT \parallel U \parallel V) \parallel W$ holds. By Lemma 11, for every variable z, $\vdash (\Im xT \parallel U \parallel V)\left\{{}^{z}/_{y}\right\} \parallel W$ holds. Furthermore, since $y \# (\Im xT \parallel V)$, $(\Im xT \parallel U \parallel V)\left\{{}^{z}/_{y}\right\} \parallel W \equiv \Im xT \parallel U\left\{{}^{z}/_{y}\right\} \parallel V \parallel W$.

The strict multiset inequality $\left|\Im xT \parallel U\left\{{}^{z}/_{y}\right\} \parallel V \parallel W\right|_{occ} \sqsubset |\Im xT \parallel \forall yU \parallel V \parallel W|_{occ}$ holds. Hence, by the induction hypothesis, for every variable z, there exist predicates P^z and Q^z such that $\vdash T \parallel Q^z$ and $x \# P^z$ and either $P^z = Q^z$ or $P^z = \text{⅄}xQ^z$, and also $U\left\{{}^{z}/_{y}\right\} \parallel V \parallel W \longrightarrow P^z$.

Define W^z such that if $P^z = Q^z$ then $W^z = \forall zQ^z$ and if $P^z = \text{⅄}xQ^z$ then $W^z = \text{⅄}x\forall zQ^z$. Hence if $P^z = \text{⅄}xQ^z$ then since $\forall$ permutes with any quantifier $\forall z\text{⅄}xQ^z \longrightarrow \text{⅄}x\forall zQ^z$. Hence, for a fresh z such that $z \# (\forall yU \parallel V \parallel W)$ and $z \# T$, the following derivation can be constructed: $\forall yU \parallel V \parallel W \longrightarrow \forall z\left(U\left\{{}^{z}/_{y}\right\} \parallel V \parallel W\right) \longrightarrow \forall zP^z \longrightarrow W^z$. Also, since $z \# T$ the proof $T \parallel \forall zQ_i^z \longrightarrow \forall z\,(T \parallel Q^z) \longrightarrow \forall z\text{I} \longrightarrow \text{I}$. Furthermore, by Lemma 26 $|W^z| \preceq |\forall yU \parallel V \parallel W|$; hence $|T \parallel \forall zQ^z| \prec |\Im xT \parallel \forall yU \parallel V \parallel W|$ since the wen count strictly decreases.

We present case presented where the principal predicate moves entirely to the left hand side of seq operator. The case where the principal predicate moves entirely to the right hand side of the seq operator, and the case for times, are similar to the case presented below. Consider the commutative case for seq in the presence of principal predicate $\Im xU$. In this case, the bottommost rule in a proof is of the form $\Im xU \parallel (V \,;\, W) \parallel P \parallel Q \longrightarrow ((\Im xU \parallel V \parallel W) \,;\, P) \parallel Q$ such that $\vdash ((\Im xU \parallel V \parallel W) \,;\, P) \parallel Q$ holds.

By the induction hypothesis, there exist R_i and S_i such that $\vdash \Im xU \parallel V \parallel W \parallel R_i$ and $\vdash P \parallel S_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that the derivation $Q \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\, R_1 \,;\, S_1, \ldots, R_n \,;\, S_n \,\}$ holds, and furthermore the size of the proof of $|\Im xU \parallel V \parallel W \parallel R_i|$ is bounded above by the size of the proof of $((\Im xU \parallel V \parallel W) \,;\, P) \parallel Q$ hence strictly bounded above by the size of the proof of $\Im xU \parallel (V \,;\, W) \parallel P \parallel Q$ enabling the induction hypothesis. By the induction hypothesis again, there exist predicates T_i and $\hat{T}_i$ such that $\vdash U \parallel \hat{T}_i$ and $x \# T_i$ and either $T_i = U_i$ or $T_i = \text{⅄}xU_i$, and also the derivation $V \parallel W \parallel R_i \longrightarrow T_i$ holds.

Hence the following derivation can be constructed.

$$\begin{array}{rcl}(V\ ;\ W) \parallel P \parallel Q & \longrightarrow & (V\ ;\ W) \parallel P \parallel \mathcal{T}\{\ R_1\ ;\ S_1, \ldots, R_n\ ;\ S_n\ \} \\ & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\{\ (V\ ;\ W) \parallel P \parallel R_i\ ;\ S_i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n\ \} \\ & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\{\ (V \parallel W \parallel R_i)\ ;\ (P \parallel S_i) : 1 \leq i \leq n\ \} \\ & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\{\ V \parallel W \parallel R_i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n\ \} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ T_i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n\ \}\end{array}$$

Furthermore, by Lemma 26, $|T_i| \leq |(V\ ;\ W) \parallel P \parallel Q|$ and hence $\left|U \parallel \hat{T}_i\right| \prec \Im xU \parallel (V\ ;\ W) \parallel P \parallel Q$, since the *wen* count strictly decreases.

Commutative cases involving all and with. Consider the commutative case for *with* where $T_0 \otimes T_1$ is the principal predicate. In this case the bottommost rule is the following form, where $\vdash (((T_0 \otimes T_1) \parallel U \parallel W)\ \&\ ((T_0 \otimes T_1) \parallel V \parallel W)) \parallel P$ holds.

$$(T_0 \otimes T_1) \parallel (U\ \&\ V) \parallel W \parallel P \longrightarrow ((T_0 \otimes T_1) \parallel U \parallel W\ \&\ (T_0 \otimes T_1) \parallel V \parallel W) \parallel P$$

By Lemma 10, $\vdash (T_0 \otimes T_1) \parallel U \parallel W \parallel P$ and $\vdash (T_0 \otimes T_1) \parallel V \parallel W \parallel P$; and furthermore the following two strict multiset inequalities hold: $|(T_0 \otimes T_1) \parallel U \parallel W \parallel P|_{occ} \sqsubset |\Im xT \parallel (U\ \&\ V) \parallel W \parallel P|_{occ}$ and $|(T_0 \otimes T_1) \parallel V \parallel W \parallel P|_{occ} \sqsubset |\Im xT \parallel (U\ \&\ V) \parallel W \parallel P|_{occ}$.

Hence, by the induction hypothesis, there exist Q_i^0 and Q_i^1 such that $\vdash T_0 \parallel Q_i^0$ and $\vdash T_1 \parallel Q_i^1$, for $1 \leq i \leq m$; and R_j^0 and R_j^1 such that $\vdash T_0 \parallel R_j^0$ and $\vdash T_1 \parallel R_j^1$, for $1 \leq j \leq n$; and also m-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}^0\{\ \}$ and n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}^1\{\ \}$ such that the two derivations $U \parallel W \parallel P \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^0\left\{\ Q_i^0 \parallel Q_i^1 \colon 1 \leq i \leq m\ \right\}$ and $V \parallel W \parallel P \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^1\left\{\ R_j^0 \parallel R_j^1 \colon 1 \leq j \leq n\ \right\}$ hold. Furthermore, the size of the proofs of $T_0 \parallel R_j^0$, $T_1 \parallel R_j^1$, $T_0 \parallel Q_i^0$ and $T_1 \parallel Q_i^1$ are bounded above by the size of the proof of $(T_0 \otimes T_1) \parallel (U\ \&\ V) \parallel W \parallel P$.

Thereby the following derivation can be constructed.

$$\begin{array}{rcl}(U\ \&\ V) \parallel W \parallel P & \longrightarrow & (U \parallel W \parallel P)\ \&\ (V \parallel W \parallel P) \\ & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}^0\left\{\ Q_i^0 \parallel Q_i^1 \colon 1 \leq i \leq m\ \right\}\ \&\ \mathcal{T}^1\left\{\ R_j^0 \parallel R_j^1 \colon 1 \leq j \leq n\ \right\}\end{array}$$

Consider the case where universal quantification commutes with $T_0 \otimes T_1$ as the principal predicate. Suppose the bottommost rule is of the form $(T_0 \otimes T_1) \parallel \forall yU \parallel V \parallel W \longrightarrow \forall y\,((T_0 \otimes T_1) \parallel U \parallel V) \parallel W$, assuming $y\ \#\ (\Im xT \parallel V)$ where $\vdash \forall y\,((T_0 \otimes T_1) \parallel U \parallel V) \parallel W$ holds. By Lemma 11, for every variable z, $\vdash ((T_0 \otimes T_1) \parallel U \parallel V)\left\{{}^{z}/_{y}\right\} \parallel W$ holds. Furthermore, since $y\ \#\ ((T_0 \otimes T_1) \parallel V)$, $((T_0 \otimes T_1) \parallel U \parallel V)\left\{{}^{z}/_{y}\right\} \parallel W \equiv (T_0 \otimes T_1) \parallel U\left\{{}^{z}/_{y}\right\} \parallel V \parallel W$.

Since $\forall$ is removed, $\left|(T_0 \otimes T_1) \parallel U\left\{{}^{z}/_{y}\right\} \parallel V \parallel W\right|_{occ} \sqsubset |(T_0 \otimes T_1) \parallel \forall yU \parallel V \parallel W|_{occ}$ holds. Pick a fresh z such that $z\ \#\ (\forall yU \parallel V \parallel W)$. Hence, by the induction hypothesis, there exist predicates P_i and Q_i such that $\vdash T_0 \parallel P_i$ and $\vdash T_1 \parallel Q_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$; and also n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that $U\left\{{}^{z}/_{y}\right\} \parallel V \parallel W \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ P_i \parallel Q_i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n\ \}$. Furthermore, the size of the proof of $T_0 \parallel P_i$ and $T_1 \parallel Q_i$ are bounded above by the size of the proof of $(T_0 \otimes T_1) \parallel \forall yU \parallel V \parallel W$.

Since z was chosen such that $z\ \#\ \forall yU \parallel V \parallel W$ the following derivation can be constructed, as required. $\forall yU \parallel V \parallel W \longrightarrow \forall z\left(U\left\{{}^{z}/_{y}\right\} \parallel V \parallel W\right) \longrightarrow \forall z\mathcal{T}\{\ P_i \parallel Q_i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n\ \}$.

Consider the commutative case for *with* where $T_0\ ;\ T_1$ is the principal predicate. The bottommost rule is the form $(T_0\ ;\ T_1) \parallel (U\ \&\ V) \parallel W \parallel P \longrightarrow ((T_0\ ;\ T_1) \parallel U \parallel W\ \&\ (T_0\ ;\ T_1) \parallel V \parallel W) \parallel P$ where $\vdash (((T_0\ ;\ T_1) \parallel U \parallel W)\ \&\ ((T_0\ ;\ T_1) \parallel V \parallel W)) \parallel P$ holds. By Lemma 10, $\vdash (T_0\ ;\ T_1) \parallel U \parallel W \parallel P$ and $\vdash (T_0\ ;\ T_1) \parallel V \parallel W \parallel P$; and furthermore the following two strict multiset inequalities hold: $|(T_0\ ;\ T_1) \parallel U \parallel W \parallel P|_{occ} \sqsubset |\Im xT \parallel (U\ \&\ V) \parallel W \parallel P|_{occ}$ and $|(T_0\ ;\ T_1) \parallel V \parallel W \parallel P|_{occ} \sqsubset |\Im xT \parallel (U\ \&\ V) \parallel W \parallel P|_{occ}$.

Hence, by the induction hypothesis, there exist Q_i^0 and Q_i^1 such that $\vdash T_0 \parallel Q_i^0$ and $\vdash T_1 \parallel Q_i^1$, for $1 \leq i \leq m$; and R_j^0 and R_j^1 such that $\vdash T_0 \parallel R_j^0$ and $\vdash T_1 \parallel R_j^1$, for $1 \leq j \leq n$; and also m-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}^0\{\ \}$ and n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}^1\{\ \}$ such that the two derivations $U \parallel W \parallel P \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^0\left\{ Q_i^0 \ ; Q_i^1 \colon 1 \leq i \leq m \right\}$ and $V \parallel W \parallel P \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^1\left\{ R_j^0 \ ; R_j^1 \colon 1 \leq j \leq n \right\}$ hold. Furthermore, the size of the proofs of $T_0 \parallel R_j^0$, $T_1 \parallel R_j^1$, $T_0 \parallel Q_i^0$ and $T_1 \parallel Q_i^1$ are bounded above by the size of the proof of $(T_0 \ ; T_1) \parallel (U \ \& \ V) \parallel W \parallel P$.

Thereby the following derivation can be constructed.

$$\begin{array}{rcl} (U \ \& \ V) \parallel W \parallel P & \longrightarrow & (U \parallel W \parallel P) \ \& \ (V \parallel W \parallel P) \\ & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}^0\left\{ Q_i^0 \ ; Q_i^1 \colon 1 \leq i \leq m \right\} \ \& \ \mathcal{T}^1\left\{ R_j^0 \ ; R_j^1 \colon 1 \leq j \leq n \right\} \end{array}$$

Consider the case where universal quantification commutes with $T_0 \ ; T_1$ as the principal predicate. Suppose the bottommost rule is of the form $(T_0 \ ; T_1) \parallel \forall y U \parallel V \parallel W \longrightarrow \forall y\,((T_0 \ ; T_1) \parallel U \parallel V) \parallel W$, assuming $y \ \# \ (\exists x T \parallel V)$ where $\vdash \forall y\,((T_0 \ ; T_1) \parallel U \parallel V) \parallel W$ holds. By Lemma 11, for every variable z, $\vdash ((T_0 \ ; T_1) \parallel U \parallel V)\left\{{}^{z}/_{y}\right\} \parallel W$ holds. Furthermore, since $y \ \# \ ((T_0 \ ; T_1) \parallel V)$, $((T_0 \ ; T_1) \parallel U \parallel V)\left\{{}^{z}/_{y}\right\} \parallel W \equiv (T_0 \ ; T_1) \parallel U\left\{{}^{z}/_{y}\right\} \parallel V \parallel W$.

The strict multiset inequality $\left|(T_0 \ ; T_1) \parallel U\left\{{}^{z}/_{y}\right\} \parallel V \parallel W\right|_{occ} \sqsubset |(T_0 \otimes T_1) \parallel \forall y U \parallel V \parallel W|_{occ}$ holds. Pick a fresh z such that $z \ \# \ (\forall y U \parallel V \parallel W)$. Hence, by the induction hypothesis, there exist predicates P_i and Q_i such that $\vdash T_0 \parallel P_i$ and $\vdash T_1 \parallel Q_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$; and also n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that $U\left\{{}^{z}/_{y}\right\} \parallel V \parallel W \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{ P_i \ ; Q_i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \}$. Furthermore, the size of the proof of $T_0 \parallel P_i$ and $T_1 \parallel Q_i$ are bounded above by the size of the proof of $(T_0 \ ; T_1) \parallel \forall y U \parallel V \parallel W$.

Since z was chosen such that $z \ \# \ \forall y U \parallel V \parallel W$ the following derivation can be constructed, as required. $\forall y U \parallel V \parallel W \longrightarrow \forall z\left(U\left\{{}^{z}/_{y}\right\} \parallel V \parallel W\right) \longrightarrow \forall z \mathcal{T}\{ P_i \ ; Q_i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \}$.

Consider the commutative case for sequential composition in the presence of principal predicate $T \ ; U$, where the *seq* connective in the principal predicate is not active on the *sequence* rule. In this case, the bottommost rule in a proof is of the following form, where $T \ ; U \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$ and $P \not\equiv \mathrm{I}$.

$$(T \ ; U) \parallel (V \ ; P) \parallel W \parallel Q \longrightarrow (((T \ ; U) \parallel V \parallel W) \ ; P) \parallel Q$$

such that $\vdash (((T \ ; U) \parallel V \parallel W) \ ; P) \parallel Q$ holds. By the induction hypothesis, there exists R_i, S_i such that $\vdash (T \ ; U) \parallel V \parallel W \parallel R_i$ and $\vdash P \parallel S_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that the following derivation holds: $Q \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{ R_1 \ ; S_1, \ldots, R_n \ ; S_n \}$.

Furthermore, $|(T \ ; U) \parallel V \parallel W \parallel R_i| \sqsubseteq |(((T \ ; U) \parallel V \parallel W) \ ; P) \parallel Q|$ hence the induction hypothesis is enabled again. By the induction hypothesis, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, there exist predicates P_j^i and Q_j^i such that $\vdash T \parallel P_j^i$ and $\vdash U \parallel Q_j^i$ hold, for $1 \leq j \leq m_i$, and killing contexts $\mathcal{T}^i\{\ \}$ such that the following derivation holds.

$$V \parallel W \parallel R_i \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^i\left\{ P_1^i \ ; Q_1^i, \ldots, P_{m_i}^i \ ; Q_{m_i}^i \right\}$$

Furthermore the following strict multiset inequalities hold.

$$\left|T \parallel P_j^i\right| \sqsubset |(T \ ; U) \parallel (V \ ; P) \parallel W \parallel Q| \qquad \text{and} \qquad \left|U \parallel Q_j^i\right| \sqsubset |(T \ ; U) \parallel (V \ ; P) \parallel W \parallel Q|$$

Hence the following derivation can be constructed, as required.

$$\begin{array}{rcl} (V \ ; P) \parallel W \parallel Q & \longrightarrow & (V \ ; P) \parallel W \parallel \mathcal{T}\{ R_1 \ ; S_1, \ldots, R_n \ ; S_n \} \\ & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\{ (V \ ; P) \parallel W \parallel (R_1 \ ; S_1), \ldots, (V \ ; P) \parallel W \parallel (R_n \ ; S_n) \} \\ & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\{ (V \parallel W \parallel R_1) \ ; (P \parallel S_1), \ldots, (V \parallel W \parallel R_n) \ ; (P \parallel S_n) \} \\ & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\{ V \parallel W \parallel R_1, \ldots, V \parallel W \parallel R_n \} \\ & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\left\{ \mathcal{T}^i\left\{ P_j^i \ ; Q_j^i \colon 1 \leq j \leq m_i \right\} \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \right\} \end{array}$$

The case for the *sequence* rule commuting with the principal predicate $T \otimes U$ is similar to the above case. Also the cases for the *switch* rule commuting with seq and times as the principal predicate, follow a similar pattern.

Commutative cases deep in contexts. In many commutative cases, the bottommost rule does not interfere with the principal predicate. Four such cases are presented for *seq* and *wen*. Other such cases are almost identical.

Consider when a rule is applied outside the scope of the principal predicate. In this case, the bottommost rule in a proof is of the form $\Im xU \parallel C\{\ V\ \} \longrightarrow \Im xU \parallel C\{\ W\ \}$, such that $\vdash \Im xU \parallel C\{\ W\ \}$. By the induction hypothesis, there exist predicates P and Q such that $\vdash U \parallel Q$ and $x \# P$ and either $P = Q$ or $P = \mathsf{N}xQ$, and also $C\{\ W\ \} \longrightarrow P$. Hence clearly, the following derivation holds, satisfying the induction invariant. $C\{\ V\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ W\ \} \longrightarrow P$ Furthermore, $|\Im xU \parallel C\{\ W\ \}| \prec |U \parallel C\{\ W\ \}|$, and $|U \parallel C\{\ W\ \}| \leq |\Im xU \parallel C\{\ V\ \}|$ by Lemma 26. A similar proof holds for N.

Assume that the following application of any rule $(T\ ;\ U) \parallel C\{\ V\ \} \longrightarrow (T\ ;\ U) \parallel C\{\ W\ \}$ is the bottommost rule in a proof, such that $\vdash (T\ ;\ U) \parallel C\{\ W\ \}$. By the induction hypothesis, there exist n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ and predicates Q_i and R_i such that $\vdash T \parallel Q_i$ and $\vdash U \parallel R_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, such that $C\{\ W\ \} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ Q_1\ ;\ R_1, \ldots, Q_n\ ;\ R_n\ \}$. Hence, the derivation $C\{\ V\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ W\ \} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ Q_1\ ;\ R_1, \ldots, Q_n\ ;\ R_n\ \}$ holds, satisfying the induction invariant. A similar proof holds for *times*.

Alternatively, the bottommost rule may appear inside the context of principal predicate without affecting the root connective of the principal predicate. We provide one illustrative case where sequential composition is the principal predicate. Assume that the following application of any rule is the bottommost rule in a proof $(C\{\ T\ \}\ ;\ V) \parallel W \longrightarrow (C\{\ U\ \}\ ;\ V) \parallel W$ such that $\vdash (C\{\ U\ \}\ ;\ V) \parallel W$ has a proof of length n. Hence by induction, there exist n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ and predicates P_i and Q_i such that $\vdash C\{\ U\ \} \parallel P_i$ and $\vdash V \parallel Q_i$ hold and have a proof no longer than n, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and also $W \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ P_1\ ;\ Q_1, \ldots, P_n\ ;\ Q_n\ \}$. Hence we can construct the following proof of length no longer than $n + 1$, for all i, as required: $C\{\ T\ \} \parallel P_i \longrightarrow C\{\ U\ \} \parallel P_i \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$. A similar proof holds for N.

Assume that the following application of any rule in a derivation of the form $\Im xC\{\ T\ \} \parallel W \longrightarrow \Im xC\{\ U\ \} \parallel W$ is the bottommost rule is a proof of length $k + 1$, where $\vdash \Im xC\{\ U\ \} \parallel W$ has a proof of length k. Hence, by induction, there exist predicates P and Q such that $\vdash C\{\ U\ \} \parallel Q$ and $x \# P$ and either $P = Q$ or $P = \mathsf{N}xQ$, and also $W \longrightarrow P$. Furthermore, the size of the proof of $C\{\ U\ \} \parallel Q$ is bounded above by the size of the proof of $\Im xC\{\ U\ \} \parallel W$; hence either $|C\{\ U\ \} \parallel Q| \prec |\Im xC\{\ U\ \} \parallel W|$ or $|C\{\ U\ \} \parallel Q| = |\Im xC\{\ U\ \} \parallel W|$ and the length of the proof of $U \parallel Q$ is bound by k.

The proof $C\{\ T\ \} \parallel Q \longrightarrow C\{\ U\ \} \parallel Q \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$ can be constructed as required. Furthermore, if $|C\{\ U\ \} \parallel Q| \prec \Im x\,|C\{\ U\ \} \parallel W|$ then $|C\{\ U\ \} \parallel Q| \prec |\Im xC\{\ U\ \} \parallel C\{\ V\ \}|$, by Lemma 26. Otherwise, $|C\{\ U\ \} \parallel Q| = |\Im xC\{\ U\ \} \parallel W|$ hence $U \parallel Q \leq \Im xU \parallel C\{\ V\ \}$ by Lemma 26 and the length of the proof of $\vdash C\{\ T\ \} \parallel Q$ is $k + 1$. Thereby in either case, the size of the proof of $C\{\ T\ \} \parallel Q$ is bounded above by the size of the proof of $\Im xC\{\ T\ \} \parallel W$. A similar proof holds for *times*.

All cases have been considered. Hence this splitting lemma follows by induction over the size of the proof. □

The final three splitting lemmas mainly involve checking commutative cases, which follow a pattern.

▶ **Lemma 28.** *If $\vdash \exists xT \parallel U$, then there exist predicates V_i and values v_i such that $\vdash T\{^{v_i}/_x\} \parallel V_i$, where $1 \leq i \leq n$, and n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that $U \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_n\ \}$ and if y appears in $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ then $y \#\ (\exists xT)$.*

Proof. The proof proceeds by induction on the size of the proof the principal *exists* operator is removed from the proof, as in the following base case. Consider when the select rule is the bottommost rule in a proof of the form $\exists xT \parallel U \longrightarrow T\{^{v}/_{x}\} \parallel U$. Since $\vdash T\{^{v}/_{x}\} \parallel V$ splitting is immediately satisfied.

As in every splitting lemma, there are commutative cases for *new*, *wen*, *all*, *with*, *seq* and *times*.

Consider the commutative case for & where $\exists xT$ is the principal predicate. The bottommost rule is the following form. $\exists xT \parallel (U \,\&\, V) \parallel W \parallel P \longrightarrow (\exists xT \parallel U \parallel W \,\&\, \exists xT \parallel V \parallel W) \parallel P$ where $\vdash ((\exists xT \parallel U \parallel W) \,\&\, (\exists xT \parallel V \parallel W)) \parallel P$ holds. By Lemma 10, $\vdash \exists xT \parallel U \parallel W \parallel P$ and $\vdash \exists xT \parallel V \parallel W \parallel P$; and furthermore the following two strict multiset inequalities hold: $|\exists xT \parallel U \parallel W \parallel P| \sqsubset |\exists xT \parallel (U \,\&\, V) \parallel W \parallel P|$ and $|\exists xT \parallel V \parallel W \parallel P| \sqsubset |\exists xT \parallel (U \,\&\, V) \parallel W \parallel P|$.

Hence, by the induction hypothesis, there exist Q_i and u_i such that $\vdash T\{^{u_i}/_{x}\} \parallel Q_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq m$, and R_j and v_j such that $\vdash T\{^{v_j}/_{x}\} \parallel R_j$, for $1 \leq j \leq n$; and m-ary and n-ary killing contexts $\mathcal{T}^0\{\ \}$ and $\mathcal{T}^1\{\ \}$ such that the following two derivations hold.

$$U \parallel W \parallel P \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^0\{\, Q_1, \ldots, Q_m \,\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad V \parallel W \parallel P \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^1\{\, R_1, \ldots, R_n \,\}$$

Thereby the following derivation can be constructed.

$$(U \,\&\, V) \parallel W \parallel P \longrightarrow (U \parallel W \parallel P) \,\&\, (V \parallel W \parallel P) \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^0\{\, Q_1, \ldots, Q_m \,\} \,\&\, \mathcal{T}^1\{\, R_1, \ldots, R_n \,\}$$

Notice that $\mathcal{T}^0\{\ \} \,\&\, \mathcal{T}^1\{\ \}$ is an $m + n$-ary killing context, as required.

Consider the case when universal quantification commutes with an existential quantifier. In this case, the bottommost rule is of the form $\exists xT \parallel \forall yU \parallel V \parallel W \longrightarrow \forall y\,(\exists xT \parallel U \parallel V) \parallel W$, assuming $y \,\#\, (\exists xT \parallel V)$ where $\vdash \forall y\,(\exists xT \parallel U \parallel V) \parallel W$ holds. By Lemma 11, for every variable z, $\vdash (\exists xT \parallel U \parallel V)\left\{^{z}/_{y}\right\} \parallel W$ holds. Furthermore, since $y \,\#\, (\exists xT \parallel V)$, $(\exists xT \parallel U \parallel V)\left\{^{z}/_{y}\right\} \parallel W \equiv \exists xT \parallel U\left\{^{z}/_{y}\right\} \parallel V \parallel W$.

The strict multiset inequality $\left|\exists xT \parallel U\left\{^{z}/_{y}\right\} \parallel V \parallel W\right| \sqsubset |\exists xT \parallel \forall yU \parallel V \parallel W|$ holds. Hence, by the induction hypothesis, for every variable z, there exist predicates P^z_i and values v^z_i such that $\vdash T\left\{^{v^z_i}/_{x}\right\} \parallel P^z_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that the following derivation holds: $U\left\{^{z}/_{y}\right\} \parallel V \parallel W \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\left\{\, P^z_1, \ldots, P^z_n \,\right\}$.

Hence, for a fresh z such that $z \,\#\, (\forall yU \parallel V \parallel W)$, the following derivation can be constructed: $\forall yU \parallel V \parallel W \longrightarrow \forall z\left(U\left\{^{z}/_{y}\right\} \parallel V \parallel W\right) \longrightarrow \forall z\left(\mathcal{T}\left\{\, P^z_1, \ldots, P^z_n \,\right\}\right)$. Notice that $\forall z\,(\mathcal{T}\{\ \})$ is a n-ary killing context as required.

We present the cases where the sequence rule commutes with the principal predicate without direct involvement in the root connective of the principal predicate. The cases are presented where the principal predicate moves entirely to the left hand side of seq operator. The cases where the principal predicate moves entirely to the right hand side of the seq operator, and the cases for times, are similar to the cases presented below.

Consider the commutative case for seq in the presence of principal predicate $\exists xU$. In this case, the bottommost rule in a proof is of the following form. $\exists xU \parallel (V \,;\, W) \parallel P \parallel Q \longrightarrow ((\exists xU \parallel V \parallel W) \,;\, P) \parallel Q$ such that $\vdash ((\exists xU \parallel V \parallel W) \,;\, P) \parallel Q$ holds.

By Lemma 27, there exist R_i, S_i such that $\vdash \exists xU \parallel V \parallel W \parallel R_i$ and $\vdash P \parallel S_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that the derivation $Q \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\, R_1 \,;\, S_1, \ldots, R_n \,;\, S_n \,\}$ holds, and furthermore the size of the proof of $|\exists xU \parallel V \parallel W \parallel R_i|$ is bounded above by the size of the proof of $((\exists xU \parallel V \parallel W) \,;\, P) \parallel Q$ hence strictly bounded above by the size of the proof of $\exists xU \parallel (V \,;\, W) \parallel P \parallel Q$ enabling the induction hypothesis. By the induction hypothesis, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, there exist predicates P^i_j and terms t^i_j such that $\vdash U\left\{^{t^i_j}/_{x}\right\} \parallel P^i_j$, for $1 \leq j \leq m_i$, and killing contexts $\mathcal{T}^i\{\ \}$ such that the derivation $V \parallel W \parallel R_i \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^i\left\{\, P^i_1, \ldots, P^i_{m_i} \,\right\}$ holds.

Hence the following derivation can be constructed, as required.

$$\begin{array}{rl}(V\ ;\ W) \parallel P \parallel Q \longrightarrow & (V\ ;\ W) \parallel P \parallel \mathcal{T}\{\ R_1\ ;\ S_1, \ldots, R_n\ ;\ S_n\ \} \\ \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\{\ (V\ ;\ W) \parallel P \parallel R_i\ ;\ S_i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n\ \} \\ \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\{\ (V \parallel W \parallel R_i)\ ;\ (P \parallel S_i) \colon 1 \leq i \leq n\ \} \\ \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\{\ V \parallel W \parallel R_i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n\ \} \\ \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\Big\{\ \mathcal{T}^1\Big\{\ P^1_1, \ldots, P^1_{m_1}\ \Big\}, \ldots, \mathcal{T}^n\Big\{\ P^n_1, \ldots, P^n_{m_n}\ \Big\}\ \Big\}\end{array}$$

Notice that $\mathcal{T}\Big\{\ \mathcal{T}^1\{\ \}, \ldots, \mathcal{T}^n\{\ \}\ \Big\}$ is a $\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i$-ary killing context as required.

Consider the case when the *new* quantifier commutes with an existential quantifier. In this case, the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $\exists x P \parallel \mathit{И} y Q \parallel R \parallel S \longrightarrow \mathit{И} y\,(\exists x P \parallel Q \parallel R) \parallel S$, where $y \# \exists x P \parallel R$. By Lemma 27, there exist T and U such that $\vdash \exists x P \parallel Q \parallel R \parallel U$, $y \# T$ and either $T = U$ or $T = \Im y U$, and also $S \longrightarrow T$. Furthermore, the size of the proof of $\exists x P \parallel Q \parallel R \parallel U$ is bounded above by the size of the proof of $\mathit{И} y\,(\exists x P \parallel Q \parallel R) \parallel S$ and hence strictly bounded above by the size of the proof of $\exists x P \parallel \mathit{И} y Q \parallel R \parallel S$, enabling the induction hypothesis. Hence, by the induction hypothesis, there exist predicates V_i and terms t_i such that $\vdash P\{{}^{t_i}/_{x}\} \parallel V_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that $Q \parallel R \parallel U \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ V_1, \ldots, V_n\ \}$.

Observe that either $T = U$ and $y \# U$ hence $\mathit{И} y Q \parallel R \parallel T \longrightarrow \mathit{И} y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U)$; or $T = \Im y U$ hence $\mathit{И} y Q \parallel R \parallel \Im y U \longrightarrow \mathit{И} y\,(Q \parallel R) \parallel \Im y U \longrightarrow \mathit{И} y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U)$. Hence the following derivation can be constructed, by applying one of the above cases.

$$\mathit{И} y Q \parallel R \parallel S \longrightarrow \mathit{И} y Q \parallel R \parallel T \longrightarrow \mathit{И} y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U) \longrightarrow \mathit{И} y \mathcal{T}\{\ V_1, \ldots, V_n\ \}$$

Observe that $\mathit{И} y \mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ is a n-ary killing context as required.

Consider the case when the *wen* quantifier commutes with an existential quantifier. In this case, the bottommost rule of a proof is of the form $\exists x P \parallel \Im y Q \parallel R \parallel S \longrightarrow \Im y\,(\exists x P \parallel Q \parallel R) \parallel S$, where $y \# \exists x P \parallel R$. By Lemma 27, there exist T and U such that $\vdash \exists x P \parallel Q \parallel R \parallel U$, $y \# T$ and either $T = U$ or $T = \mathit{И} y U$, and also $S \longrightarrow T$. Furthermore, the size of the proof of $\exists x P \parallel Q \parallel R \parallel U$ is bounded above by the size of the proof of $\Im y\,(\exists x P \parallel Q \parallel R) \parallel S$ and hence strictly bounded above by the size of the proof of $\exists x P \parallel \Im y Q \parallel R \parallel S$, enabling the induction hyothesis. Hence, by the induction hypothesis, there exist predicates V_i and terms t_i such that $\vdash P\{{}^{t_i}/_{x}\} \parallel V_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that $Q \parallel R \parallel U \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^i\{\ V_1, \ldots, V_n\ \}$.

Observe that either $T = U$ and $y \# U$ hence $\Im y Q \parallel R \parallel T \longrightarrow \Im y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U) \longrightarrow \mathit{И} y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U)$; or $T = \mathit{И} y U$ hence $\Im y Q \parallel R \parallel \mathit{И} y U \longrightarrow \Im y\,(Q \parallel R) \parallel \mathit{И} y U \longrightarrow \mathit{И} y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U)$. Hence the following derivation can be constructed, by applying one of the above cases.

$$\Im y Q \parallel R \parallel S \longrightarrow \Im y Q \parallel R \parallel T \longrightarrow \mathit{И} y\,(Q \parallel R \parallel U) \longrightarrow \mathit{И} y \mathcal{T}\{\ U_1, \ldots, U_n\ \}$$

Observe that $\mathit{И} y \mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ is a n-ary killing context as required.

In many commutative cases, the bottommost rule does not interfere with the principal predicate. Consider when a rule is applied outside the scope of the principal predicate. In this case, the bottommost rule in a proof is of the form $\exists x U \parallel C\{\ V\ \} \longrightarrow \exists x U \parallel C\{\ W\ \}$ such that $\vdash \exists x U \parallel C\{\ W\ \}$. By the induction hypothesis, there exist predicates P_i and terms t_i, for $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that $\vdash U\{{}^{t_i}/_{x}\} \parallel P_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that $C\{\ W\ \} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ P_1, \ldots, P_n\ \}$. Hence clearly, $C\{\ V\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ W\ \} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ P_1, \ldots, P_n\ \}$ as required.

The bottommost rule may appear inside the context of principal predicate without affecting the connective itself. Assume that the following application of any rule is the bottommost rule is a proof $\exists x C\{\ T\ \} \parallel W \longrightarrow \exists x C\{\ U\ \} \parallel W$ such that $\vdash \exists x C\{\ U\ \} \parallel W$. Hence, by induction, there exist

predicates P_i and terms t_i where $\vdash C\{\ U\ \}\{^{t_i}/_x\} \parallel P_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that the derivation $W \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ P_1, \ldots, P_n\ \}$ holds. Hence, by Lemma 7, we can construct the following proof, for all i, as required: $C\{\ T\ \}\{^{v_i}/_x\} \parallel P_i \longrightarrow C\{\ U\ \}\{^{v_i}/_x\} \parallel P_i \longrightarrow \mathbb{1}$.

Thereby, all cases for the splitting lemma for existential quantification have been considered. □

▶ **Lemma 29.** *The following statements hold, for any atom α, where if x appears in $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ then $x \# \alpha$.*

- *If $\vdash \overline{\alpha} \parallel T$, then there exist n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that $T \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ \alpha, \alpha, \ldots, \alpha\ \}$.*
- *If $\vdash \alpha \parallel T$, then there exist n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that $T \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ \overline{\alpha}, \overline{\alpha}, \ldots, \overline{\alpha}\ \}$.*

▶ **Lemma 30.** *If $\vdash (T \oplus U) \parallel V$, then there exist predicates W_i such that either $\vdash T \parallel W_i$ or $\vdash U \parallel W_i$ where $1 \leq i \leq n$, and n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that $V \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ W_1, W_2, \ldots, W_n\ \}$ and if x appears in $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ then $x \# (T \oplus U)$.*

3.5 Context Reduction and the Admissibility of Co-rules

Splitting is always performed in a *shallow context*, i.e. a hole directly inside a parallel composition. Context reduction extends rules simulated by splitting to any context.

▶ **Lemma 31** (Context reduction)**.** *If $\vdash T\sigma \parallel V$ yields that $\vdash U\sigma \parallel V$, for any predicate V and substitution of terms for variables σ, then $\vdash C\{\ T\ \}$ yields $\vdash C\{\ U\ \}$, for any context $C\{\ \}$.*

Proof. The trick is to first establish the following stronger result. If $\vdash C\{\ T\ \}$, then there exist predicates U_i and substitutions σ_i, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that $\vdash T\sigma_i \parallel U_i$; and, for any predicate V there exist W_i such that either $W_i = V\sigma_i \parallel U_i$ or $W_i = \mathbb{1}$ and the following holds: $C\{\ V\ \} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ W_1, W_2, \ldots, W_n\ \}$.

Consider the case for a context of the form $\exists x C\{\ \} \parallel P$, where $\vdash \exists x C\{\ T\ \} \parallel P$. By Lemma 28, there exist predicates Q_i and values v_i such that $\vdash C\{\ T\ \}\{^{v_i}/_x\} \parallel Q_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$; and n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that the following derivation holds. $P \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ Q_1, Q_2, \ldots, Q_n\ \}$.

For context $C\{\ \}$ and any predicate U, let $C^i\{\ \}$ and σ_i be such that $C\{\ U\ \}\{^{v_i}/_x\} \equiv C^i\{\ U\sigma_i\ \}$. Notice that for first-order quantifiers, the substitutions does not increase the size of the predicate part of the context. It can only increases the size of terms in atoms, which are not counted in this induction.

Since $\vdash C\{\ T\ \}\{^{v_i}/_x\} \parallel Q_i$ holds, then $\vdash C^i\{\ T\sigma_i\ \}\{^{v_i}/_x\} \parallel Q_i$ holds. Therefore, by induction on the size of the predicate part of the context (n.b. not counting the size of atoms), there exists predicate V^i_j such that either $V^i_j = \mathbb{1}$ or $V^i_j = (U\sigma_i)\,\sigma^i_j \parallel W^i_j$, where $\vdash (T\sigma_i)\,\sigma^i_j \parallel W^i_j$, for $1 \leq j \leq m_i$; and m_i-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}^i\{\ \}$ such that the following derivation holds.

$$C\{\ U\ \}\{^{v_i}/_x\} \parallel Q_i \equiv C^i\{\ U\sigma_i\ \} \parallel Q_i \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^i\Big\{\ V^i_1, V^i_2, \ldots, V^i_{m_i}\ \Big\}$$

Hence the following derivation can be constructed for all predicates U.

$$\begin{aligned}
\exists x C\{\ U\ \} \parallel P \longrightarrow\ & \exists x C\{\ U\ \} \parallel \mathcal{T}\{\ Q_1, \ldots, Q_n\ \} \\
\longrightarrow\ & \exists x C\{\ U\ \} \parallel \mathcal{T}\{\ Q_i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n\ \} \\
\longrightarrow\ & \mathcal{T}\{\ \exists x C\{\ U\ \} \parallel Q_i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n\ \} \\
\longrightarrow\ & \mathcal{T}\{\ C\{\ U\ \}\{^{v_i}/_x\} \parallel Q_i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n\ \} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\Big\{\ \mathcal{T}^i\Big\{\ V^i_j \colon 1 \leq j \leq m_i\ \Big\} \colon 1 \leq i \leq n\ \Big\}
\end{aligned}$$

where $V^i_j = \mathbb{1}$ or $V^i_j = U\left(\sigma_i \cdot \sigma^i_j\right) \parallel W^i_j$, such that $\vdash T\left(\sigma_i \cdot \sigma^i_j\right) \parallel W^i_j$, for all i and j. Thereby the induction invariant is satisfied.

Consider the case for a context of the form $\mathit{\Lambda} x C\{\ \} \parallel P$, where $\vdash \mathit{\Lambda} x C\{\ T\ \} \parallel P$. By Lemma 27, there exist predicates Q and $\hat{Q}$ such that $\vdash C\{\ T\ \} \parallel \hat{Q}$ and either $Q = \hat{Q}$ or Q and $\mathrel{\ni} x\hat{Q}$, and also

$P \longrightarrow Q$. Therefore, by induction on the size of the context, there exist predicates V_i and W_i and substitutions σ_i such that either $V_i = \mathrm{I}$ or $V_i = U\sigma_i \parallel W_i$, where $\vdash T\sigma_i \parallel W_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$; and n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that $C\{\ U\ \} \parallel \hat{Q} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_n\ \}$. Hence the following derivation can be constructed for all predicates U.

$$\mathit{И}xC\{\ U\ \} \parallel P \longrightarrow \mathit{И}xC\{\ U\ \} \parallel Q \longrightarrow \mathit{И}x\Big(C\{\ U\ \} \parallel \hat{Q}\Big) \longrightarrow \mathit{И}x\mathcal{T}^i\{\ V_i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n\ \}$$

Thereby the induction invariant is satisfied.

Consider the case for a context of the form $\Im xC\{\ \} \parallel P$, where $\vdash \Im xC\{\ T\ \} \parallel P$. By Lemma 27, there exist predicates Q and R such that $x \# Q$ and $\vdash C\{\ T\ \} \parallel R$ and either $Q = R$ or $Q = \mathit{И}xR$, and also $P \longrightarrow Q$. Therefore, by induction on the size of the context, there exist predicates V_i and W_i and substitutions σ_i such that either $V_i = \mathrm{I}$ or $V_i = U\sigma_i \parallel W_i$, where $\vdash T\sigma_i \parallel W_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$; and n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that $C\{\ U\ \} \parallel R \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_n\ \}$.

In the former case that $Q = R$, since $x \# Q$, the derivation $\Im xC\{\ U\ \} \parallel R \longrightarrow \mathit{И}xC\{\ U\ \} \parallel R \longrightarrow \mathit{И}x\,(C\{\ U\ \} \parallel R)$ holds. In the case, $Q = \mathit{И}xR$ the derivation $\Im xC\{\ U\ \} \parallel \mathit{И}xR \longrightarrow \mathit{И}x\,(C\{\ U\ \} \parallel R)$ holds. Hence, by applying one of the above derivations we can construct the following derivation for all predicates U.

$$\Im xC\{\ U\ \} \parallel P \longrightarrow \Im xC\{\ U\ \} \parallel Q \longrightarrow \mathit{И}x\,(C\{\ U\ \} \parallel R) \longrightarrow \mathit{И}x\mathcal{T}^i\{\ V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_n\ \}$$

Thereby the induction invariant is satisfied.

Consider the case of a context of the form $\forall xC\{\ \} \parallel P$, where $\vdash \forall xC\{\ T\ \} \parallel$ holds. By Lemma 11, for any variable y, $\vdash C\{\ T\ \}\{{}^{y}/_{x}\} \parallel P$ holds. For name y, let $C^y\{\ \}$ be such that for any predicate U, $C\{\ U\ \}\{{}^{y}/_{x}\} \equiv C^y\{\ U\{{}^{y}/_{x}\}\ \}$. For any y, by induction on the size of the context, for any predicate U, there exist predicates V_i^y such that either $V_i^y = \mathrm{I}$ or $V_i^y = U\{{}^{y}/_{x}\}\sigma_i^y \parallel W_i^y$, where $\vdash T\{{}^{y}/_{x}\}\sigma_i^y \parallel W_i^y$ holds, for $1 \leq i \leq n$; and n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}^y\{\ \}$ such that the following derivation can be constructed.

$$C\{\ U\ \}\{{}^{y}/_{x}\} \parallel P \equiv C^y\{\ U\{{}^{y}/_{x}\}\ \} \parallel P \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^y\Big\{\ V_i^y\ \Big\}$$

Therefore the next derivation can be constructed, for any U, where $y \# (\forall xC\{\ U\ \} \parallel P)$.

$$\forall xC\{\ U\ \} \parallel P \longrightarrow \forall y\,(C\{\ U\ \}\{{}^{y}/_{x}\} \parallel P) \longrightarrow \forall y\mathcal{T}^y\Big\{\ V_i^y\ \Big\}$$

In the above $V_i^y = \mathrm{I}$ or $V_i^y = U\{{}^{y}/_{x}\}\sigma_i^y \parallel W_i^y$, where $\vdash T\{{}^{y}/_{x}\}\sigma_i^y \parallel W_i^y$ holds, for all i. Thereby the induction invariant is satisfied.

The cases for *plus*, *with*, *tensor* and *seq* do not differ significantly from MAV [23].

Having established the above stronger intermediate lemma, assume that for any local predicate U, $\vdash S \parallel U$ yields $\vdash T \parallel U$, and fix any context $C\{\ \}$ such that $\vdash C\{\ S\ \}$ holds. By the above intermediate lemma, there exist n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ and, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, P_i such that either $P_i = \mathrm{I}$ or there exists W_i where $P_i = T \parallel W_i$ and $\vdash S \parallel W_i$, and furthermore $C\{\ T\ \} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ P_1, \ldots, P_n\ \}$. Since also $\vdash T \parallel W_i$ holds for $1 \leq i \leq n$, the following proof can be constructed.

$$C\{\ T\ \} \longrightarrow \quad \mathcal{T}\{\ P_1, \ldots, P_n\ \} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ \mathrm{I}, \ldots, \mathrm{I}\ \} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$$

Therefore $\vdash C\{\ T\ \}$ holds as required. □

Note that the case for existential quantifiers will not work for second order quantifiers, since termination of the induction is reliant on the size of the term-free part of the predicate being reduced. Thus the techniques in the above proof apply to first-order quantifiers only.

For every rule there is a *co-rule*, where for rule $T \longrightarrow U$, the co-rule is of the form $\overline{U} \longrightarrow \overline{T}$. For example *close* has co-rule $C\{\ \Im x\,(P \otimes Q)\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \Im xP \otimes \mathit{И}xQ\ \}$ and *extrude1* has co-rule if $x \# Q$ then $C\{\ \exists x\,(P \otimes Q)\ \} \longrightarrow C\{\ \exists xP \otimes Q\ \}$. The following eight lemmas entail that a co-rule is admissible in MAV1. In each case, the proof proceeds by applying splitting in a shallow context, forming a new proof, and finally applying Lemma 31, as demonstrated for the co-rule for *close*.

▶ **Lemma 32** (Co-close). *If* $\vdash C\{\ \Im xP \otimes \mathit{И}xQ\ \}$ *holds then* $\vdash C\{\ \Im x\,(P \otimes Q)\ \}$ *holds.*

Proof. Assume that $\vdash (\Im xP \otimes \mathit{И}xQ)\sigma \parallel R$ for some substitution of terms for variables σ. By Lemma 27, there exist S_i and T_i such that $\vdash (\Im xP)\sigma \parallel S_i$ and $\vdash (\mathit{И}xQ)\sigma \parallel T_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and n-ary killing context such that the derivation $R \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ S_i \parallel T_i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n\ \}$ holds.

Also observe that for some y such that $y \# \Im xP$, $y \# \mathit{И}xQ$ and $y \# \sigma$, $(\Im xP)\sigma \equiv \Im y\,(P\{^y/_x\}\sigma)$ and $(\mathit{И}xQ)\sigma \equiv \mathit{И}y\,(Q\{^y/_x\}\sigma)$, where $y \# \sigma$ is defined such that y does not appear in the domain of σ nor free in any term in the range of σ. Hence both $\vdash \Im y\,(P\{^y/_x\}\sigma) \parallel S_i$ and $\vdash \mathit{И}y\,(Q\{^y/_x\}\sigma) \parallel T_i$ hold.

Hence, by Lemma 27, there exist U_i and $\hat{U}_i$ such that $\vdash P\{^y/_x\}\sigma \parallel \hat{U}_i$ and either $U_i = \hat{U}_i$ or $U_i = \mathit{И}y\hat{U}_i$, and also the derivation $S_i \longrightarrow U_i$ holds.

Similarly, by Lemma 27, there exist W_i and $\hat{W}_i$ such that $\vdash Q\{^y/_x\}\sigma \parallel \hat{W}_i$ and either $W_i = \hat{W}_i$ or $W_i = \Im y\hat{W}_i$, and also the derivation $T_i \longrightarrow W_i$ holds.

There are four cases to consider for each i. Three of the cases are as follows.

- If $U_i = \mathit{И}y\hat{U}_i$ and $W_i = \Im y\hat{W}_i$ then $\mathit{И}y\hat{U}_i \parallel \Im y\hat{W}_i \longrightarrow \mathit{И}y\left(\hat{U}_i \parallel \hat{W}_i\right)$.
- If $U_i = \hat{U}_i$, such that $y \# \hat{U}_i$, and $W_i = \Im y\hat{W}_i$ then $U_i \parallel \Im y\hat{W}_i \longrightarrow \Im y\left(\hat{U}_i \parallel \hat{W}_i\right) \longrightarrow \mathit{И}y\left(\hat{U}_i \parallel \hat{W}_i\right)$.
- If $U_i = \mathit{И}y\hat{U}_i$ and $W_i = \hat{W}_i$, such that $y \# \hat{W}_i$ then $\mathit{И}xU_i \parallel \hat{W}_i \longrightarrow \mathit{И}y\left(\hat{U}_i \parallel \hat{W}_i\right)$.

Thereby in any of the above three cases the following derivation can be constructed.

$$(\Im x\,(P \otimes Q))\sigma \parallel U_i \parallel W_i \longrightarrow (\Im x\,(P \otimes Q))\sigma \parallel \mathit{И}y\left(\hat{U}_i \parallel \hat{W}_i\right) \longrightarrow \mathit{И}y\left((P \otimes Q)\{^y/_x\}\sigma \parallel \hat{U}_i \parallel \hat{W}_i\right)$$

In the fourth case $U_i = \hat{U}_i$ and $W_i = \hat{W}_i$, such that $y \# \hat{W}_i$ and $y \# \hat{U}_i$ yielding the following.

$$(\Im x\,(P \otimes Q))\sigma \parallel \hat{U}_i \parallel \hat{W}_i \longrightarrow \mathit{И}y\,((P \otimes Q)\{^y/_x\}\sigma) \parallel \hat{U}_i \parallel \hat{W}_i \longrightarrow \mathit{И}y\left((P \otimes Q)\{^y/_x\}\sigma \parallel \hat{U}_i \parallel \hat{W}_i\right)$$

By applying one of the above possible derivations for every i, the following proof can be constructed.

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Im x\,(P \otimes Q))\sigma \parallel R \longrightarrow\ & (\Im x\,(P \otimes Q))\sigma \parallel \mathcal{T}\{\ S_i \parallel T_i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n\ \} \\
\longrightarrow\ & (\Im x\,(P \otimes Q))\sigma \parallel \mathcal{T}\{\ U_i \parallel W_i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n\ \} \\
\longrightarrow\ & \mathcal{T}\{\ (\Im x\,(P \otimes Q))\sigma \parallel U_i \parallel W_i \colon 1 \leq i \leq n\ \} \\
\longrightarrow\ & \mathcal{T}\left\{\ \mathit{И}y\left((P \otimes Q)\{^y/_x\}\sigma \parallel \hat{U}_i \parallel \hat{W}_i\right) : 1 \leq i \leq n\ \right\} \\
\longrightarrow\ & \mathcal{T}\left\{\ \mathit{И}y\left(\left(P\{^y/_x\}\sigma \parallel \hat{U}_i\right) \otimes \left(Q\{^y/_x\}\sigma \parallel \hat{W}_i\right)\right) : 1 \leq i \leq n\ \right\} \\
\longrightarrow\ & \mathcal{T}\{\ \mathit{И}y\mathrm{I} \colon 1 \leq i \leq n\ \} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Lemma 31, for all contexts $C\{\ \}$, if $\vdash C\{\ \Im xP \otimes \mathit{И}xQ\ \}$ then $\vdash C\{\ \mathit{И}x\,(P \otimes Q)\ \}$. □

▶ **Lemma 33** (Co-tidy name). *If* $\vdash C\{\ \Im x\mathrm{I}\ \}$ *holds then* $\vdash C\{\ \mathrm{I}\ \}$ *holds.*

Proof. Assume that $\vdash \Im x\mathrm{I} \parallel T$ holds. By Lemma 27, there exists U such that $\vdash U$ and $T \longrightarrow U$. Hence the following proof of T can be constructed: $T \longrightarrow U \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$. Therefore, by Lemma 31, for any context $C\{\ \}$, if $\vdash C\{\ \Im x\mathrm{I}\ \}$ then $\vdash C\{\ \mathrm{I}\ \}$, as required. □

▶ **Lemma 34** (Co-extrude1). *If* $x \# U$ *and* $\vdash C\{\ \exists xT \otimes U\ \}$ *holds then* $\vdash C\{\ \exists x\,(T \otimes U)\ \}$ *holds.*

Proof. Assume that $\vdash (\exists xT \otimes U)\,\sigma \parallel V$ holds, where $x \# U$. Now $(\exists xT \otimes U)\,\sigma \parallel V \equiv (\exists y\,(T\{^y/_x\}\sigma) \otimes U\sigma) \parallel V$, where $y \# (\exists xT \otimes U)$ and $y \# \sigma$. So, by Lemma 27, there exist P_i and Q_i such that $\vdash \exists y\,(T\{^y/_x\}\sigma) \parallel P_i$ and $\vdash U\sigma \parallel Q_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and n-ary killing context such that the derivation $V \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\ P_1 \parallel Q_1, \ldots, P_n \parallel Q_n\ \}$ holds.

By Lemma 28, there exist R^i_j and v^i_j such that $\vdash T\{^y/_x\}\sigma\left\{^{v^i_j}/_y\right\} \parallel R^i_j$, for $1 \leq j \leq m_i$, and m_i-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}^i\{\ \}$ such that the derivation $P_i \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^i\left\{\ R^i_1, R^i_2, \ldots, R^i_{m_i}\ \right\}$ holds.

Hence the following proof can be constructed.

$$\begin{array}{rll}
(\exists x\,(T \otimes U))\,\sigma \parallel V \equiv & \exists y\,(T\{{}^{y}/_{x}\}\sigma \otimes U\sigma) \parallel V & \\
\longrightarrow & \exists y\,(T\{{}^{y}/_{x}\}\sigma \otimes U\sigma) \parallel \mathcal{T}\{\, P_i \parallel Q_i \colon 1 \le i \le n \,\} & \\
\longrightarrow & \exists y\,(T\{{}^{y}/_{x}\}\sigma \otimes U\sigma) \parallel \mathcal{T}\Big\{ \mathcal{T}^i\Big\{ R^i_j \colon 1 \le j \le m_i \Big\} \parallel Q_i \colon 1 \le i \le n \Big\} & \\
\longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\Big\{ \exists y\,(T\{{}^{y}/_{x}\}\sigma \otimes U\sigma) \parallel \mathcal{T}^i\Big\{ R^i_j \colon 1 \le j \le m_i \Big\} \parallel Q_i \colon 1 \le i \le n \Big\} & \\
\longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\Big\{ \mathcal{T}^i\Big\{ \exists y\,(T\{{}^{y}/_{x}\}\sigma \otimes U\sigma) \parallel R^i_j \parallel Q_i \colon 1 \le j \le m_i \Big\} : 1 \le i \le n \Big\} & \\
\longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\Big\{ \mathcal{T}^i\Big\{ \Big(T\{{}^{y}/_{x}\}\sigma\Big\{{}^{v^i_j}/_{y}\Big\} \otimes U\sigma\Big) \parallel R^i_j \parallel Q_i \colon 1 \le j \le m_i \Big\} : 1 \le i \le n \Big\} & \\
\longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\Big\{ \mathcal{T}^i\Big\{ \Big(T\{{}^{y}/_{x}\}\sigma\Big\{{}^{v^i_j}/_{y}\Big\} \parallel R^i_j\Big) \otimes (U\sigma \parallel Q_i) : 1 \le j \le m_i \Big\} : 1 \le i \le n \Big\} & \\
\longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\Big\{ \mathcal{T}^i\{\, \mathrm{I} \colon 1 \le j \le m_i \,\} : 1 \le i \le n \Big\} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I} &
\end{array}$$

Hence, by Lemma 31, if $\vdash C\{\, \exists x T \otimes U \,\}$, where $x \# U$, then $\vdash C\{\, \exists x\,(T \otimes U) \,\}$. □

▶ **Lemma 35** (Co-tidy1). *If $\vdash C\{\, \exists x \mathrm{I} \,\}$ holds then $\vdash C\{\, \mathrm{I} \,\}$ holds.*

Proof. Assume that $\vdash \exists x \mathrm{I} \parallel T$ holds. By Lemma 28, there exists U_i such that $\vdash U_i$, for $1 \le i \le n$, and n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ such that $T \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\, U_1, \ldots, U_n \,\}$. Hence the following proof of T can be constructed: $\mathrm{I} \parallel T \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\, U_1, \ldots, U_n \,\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\, \mathrm{I}, \ldots, \mathrm{I} \,\} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$. Therefore, by Lemma 31, if $\vdash C\{\, \exists x \mathrm{I} \,\}$ then $\vdash C\{\, \mathrm{I} \,\}$, as required. □

The above four lemmas are particular to MAV1. The proofs for the four lemmas below are similar to the corresponding cases in MAV [23].

▶ **Lemma 36** (Co-external). *If $\vdash C\{\, T \otimes (U \oplus V) \,\}$ holds then $\vdash C\{\, (T \otimes U) \oplus (T \otimes V) \,\}$ holds.*

Proof. Assume that $\vdash ((T \oplus U) \otimes V)\,\sigma \parallel W$ holds, for some substitution σ. By Lemma 27, there exist predicates P_i and Q_i such that $\vdash (T \oplus U)\,\sigma \parallel P_i$ and $\vdash V\sigma \parallel Q_i$, for $1 \le i \le n$, and killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ and such that $W \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{\, P_1 \parallel Q_1, \ldots, P_n \parallel Q_n \,\}$.

Now, by Lemma 30, for every i, there exists killing context $\mathcal{T}^i\{\ \}$ and types R^i_j such that either $\vdash T\sigma \parallel R^i_j$ or $\vdash U\sigma \parallel R^i_j$ holds, for $1 \le j \le m_i$, and the derivation $P_i \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^i\Big\{ R^i_1, R^i_2, \ldots, R^i_{m_i} \Big\}$ holds.

Notice that if $\vdash T\sigma \parallel R^i_j$ holds then the following derivation can be constructed.

$$((T \otimes V) \oplus (U \otimes V))\,\sigma \parallel R^i_j \parallel Q_i \longrightarrow \quad (T \otimes V)\,\sigma \parallel R^i_j \parallel Q_i \longrightarrow \Big(T\sigma \parallel R^i_j\Big) \otimes (V\sigma \parallel Q_i) \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$$

Otherwise $\vdash U \parallel R^i_j$ holds, hence the following derivation can be constructed.

$$((T \otimes V) \oplus (U \otimes V))\,\sigma \parallel R^i_j \parallel Q_i \longrightarrow \quad (U \otimes V)\,\sigma \parallel R^i_j \parallel Q_i \longrightarrow \Big(U\sigma \parallel R^i_j\Big) \otimes (V\sigma \parallel Q_i) \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$$

Hence by applying one of the above proofs for each i and j we can construct the following proof, as required.

$$\begin{array}{rl}
((T \otimes V) \oplus (U \otimes V))\,\sigma \parallel W & \\
\longrightarrow & ((T \otimes V) \oplus (U \otimes V))\,\sigma \parallel \mathcal{T}\{\, P_1 \parallel Q_1, \ldots, P_n \parallel Q_n \,\} \\
\longrightarrow & ((T \otimes V) \oplus (U \otimes V))\,\sigma \parallel \mathcal{T}\Big\{ \mathcal{T}^i\Big\{ R^i_1, R^i_2, \ldots, R^i_{m_i} \Big\} \parallel Q_i \colon 1 \le i \le n \Big\} \\
\longrightarrow & ((T \otimes V) \oplus (U \otimes V))\,\sigma \parallel \mathcal{T}\Big\{ \mathcal{T}^i\Big\{ R^i_j \parallel Q_i \colon 1 \le j \le m_i \Big\} : 1 \le i \le n \Big\} \\
\longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\Big\{ ((T \otimes V) \oplus (U \otimes V))\,\sigma \parallel \mathcal{T}^i\Big\{ R^i_j \parallel Q_i \colon 1 \le j \le m_i \Big\} : 1 \le i \le n \Big\} \\
\longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\Big\{ \mathcal{T}^i\Big\{ ((T \otimes V) \oplus (U \otimes V))\,\sigma \parallel R^i_j \parallel Q_i \colon 1 \le j \le m_i \Big\} : 1 \le i \le n \Big\} \\
\longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\Big\{ \mathcal{T}^i\{\, \mathrm{I} \colon 1 \le j \le m_i \,\} : 1 \le i \le n \Big\} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}
\end{array}$$

Hence $\vdash (T \otimes V \oplus U \otimes V) \parallel W$ holds. Therefore, by Lemma 31, for any context $\vdash C\{\, (T \oplus U) \otimes V \,\}$ yields $\vdash C\{\, T \otimes V \oplus U \otimes V \,\}$, as required. □

▶ **Lemma 37** (Co-tidy). *If $\vdash C\{\, \mathrm{I} \oplus \mathrm{I} \,\}$ holds, then $\vdash C\{\, \mathrm{I} \,\}$ holds.*

Proof. Assume that $\vdash (\mathrm{I} \oplus \mathrm{I}) \parallel P$ holds. By Lemma 30, there exist killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ and predicates U_i for $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that $\vdash \mathrm{I} \parallel U_i$ or $\vdash \mathrm{I} \parallel U_i$ hold, hence $\vdash U_i$ holds, and the following derivation can be constructed. $P \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{ U_1, \ldots, U_n \}$. Thereby the following proof can be constructed: $P \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{ U_1, \ldots, U_n \} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{ \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{I}, \ldots \} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}$. Therefore, by Lemma 31, for any context $\vdash C\{ \mathrm{I} \oplus \mathrm{I} \}$ yields $\vdash C\{ \mathrm{I} \}$, as required. □

▶ **Lemma 38** (Co-sequence). *If* $\vdash C\{ (T \ ; U) \otimes (V \ ; W) \}$ *holds then* $\vdash C\{ (T \otimes V) \ ; (U \otimes W) \}$ *holds.*

Proof. Assume that $\vdash ((T \ ; U) \otimes (V \ ; W))\sigma \parallel P$ holds, for some substitution σ. By Lemma 27, there exist n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ and Q_i^0 and Q_i^1, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, such that $\vdash (T \ ; U)\sigma \parallel Q_i^0$ and $\vdash (V \ ; W)\sigma \parallel Q_i^1$ and the derivation $P \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\left\{ Q_1^0 \parallel Q_1^1, Q_2^0 \parallel Q_2^1, \ldots \right\}$ holds.

Hence by Lemma 27, for $k \in \{0, 1\}$ there exists m_i^k-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}_i^k\{\ \}$ and types $R_{i,j}^k$, $S_{i,j}^k$ for $1 \leq j \leq m_i^k$, such that $\vdash T\sigma \parallel R_{i,j}^0$ and $\vdash U\sigma \parallel S_{i,j}^0$ and $\vdash V\sigma \parallel R_{i,j}^1$ and $\vdash W\sigma \parallel S_{i,j}^1$ and the following derivation $Q_i^k \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}_i^k\left\{ R_{i,1}^k \ ; \ S_{i,1}^k, R_{i,2}^k \ ; \ S_{i,2}^k \ldots \right\}$ holds.

Hence we can construct the following proof.

$$
\begin{aligned}
&((T \otimes V) \ ; (U \otimes W))\sigma \parallel P \\
&\quad \longrightarrow ((T \otimes V) \ ; (U \otimes W))\sigma \parallel \mathcal{T}\left\{ Q_1^0 \parallel Q_1^1, Q_2^0 \parallel Q_2^1, \ldots \right\} \\
&\quad \longrightarrow ((T \otimes V) \ ; (U \otimes W))\sigma \parallel \mathcal{T}\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathcal{T}_i^0\left\{ R_{i,j}^0 \ ; S_{i,j}^0 \colon 1 \leq j \leq m_i^0 \right\} \\ \parallel \quad \mathcal{T}_i^1\left\{ R_{i,k}^1 \ ; S_{i,k}^1 \colon 1 \leq k \leq m_i^1 \right\} \end{array} \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \right\} \\
&\quad \longrightarrow ((T \otimes V) \ ; (U \otimes W))\sigma \parallel \mathcal{T}\left\{ \mathcal{T}_i^1\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathcal{T}_i^0\left\{ R_{i,j}^0 \ ; S_{i,j}^0 \colon 1 \leq j \leq m_i^0 \right\} \parallel \left(R_{i,k}^1 \ ; S_{i,k}^1 \right) \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad : 1 \leq k \leq m_i^1 \end{array} \right\} \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \right\} \\
&\quad \longrightarrow ((T \otimes V) \ ; (U \otimes W))\sigma \parallel \mathcal{T}\left\{ \mathcal{T}_i^1\left\{ \mathcal{T}_i^0\left\{ \left(R_{i,j}^0 \ ; S_{i,j}^0 \right) \parallel \left(R_{i,k}^1 \ ; S_{i,k}^1 \right) \colon 1 \leq j \leq m_i^0 \right\} \colon 1 \leq k \leq m_i^1 \right\} \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \right\} \\
&\quad \longrightarrow ((T \otimes V) \ ; (U \otimes W))\sigma \parallel \mathcal{T}\left\{ \mathcal{T}_i^1\left\{ \mathcal{T}_i^0\left\{ \left(R_{i,j}^0 \parallel R_{i,k}^1 \right) ; \left(S_{i,j}^0 \parallel S_{i,k}^1 \right) \colon 1 \leq j \leq m_i^0 \right\} \colon 1 \leq k \leq m_i^1 \right\} \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \right\} \\
&\quad \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\left\{ \mathcal{T}_i^1\left\{ \mathcal{T}_i^0\left\{ \begin{array}{l} ((T \otimes V) \ ; (U \otimes W))\sigma \parallel \\ \left(\left(R_{i,j}^0 \parallel R_{i,k}^1 \right) ; \left(S_{i,j}^0 \parallel S_{i,k}^1 \right) \right) \end{array} \colon 1 \leq j \leq m_i^0 \right\} \colon 1 \leq k \leq m_i^1 \right\} \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \right\} \\
&\quad \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\left\{ \mathcal{T}_i^1\left\{ \mathcal{T}_i^0\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \left((T \otimes V)\sigma \parallel R_{i,j}^0 \parallel R_{i,k}^1 \right) ; \\ \left((U \otimes W)\sigma \parallel S_{i,j}^0 \parallel S_{i,k}^1 \right) \end{array} \colon 1 \leq j \leq m_i^0 \right\} \colon 1 \leq k \leq m_i^1 \right\} \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \right\} \\
&\quad \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\left\{ \mathcal{T}_i^1\left\{ \mathcal{T}_i^0\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \left(\left(T\sigma \parallel R_{i,j}^0 \right) \otimes \left(V\sigma \parallel R_{i,k}^1 \right) \right) ; \\ \left(\left(U\sigma \parallel S_{i,j}^0 \right) \otimes \left(W\sigma \parallel S_{i,k}^1 \right) \right) \end{array} \colon 1 \leq j \leq m_i^0 \right\} \colon 1 \leq k \leq m_i^1 \right\} \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \right\} \\
&\quad \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\left\{ \mathcal{T}_i^1\left\{ \mathcal{T}_i^0\left\{ \mathrm{I} \colon 1 \leq j \leq m_i^0 \right\} \colon 1 \leq k \leq m_i^1 \right\} \colon 1 \leq i \leq n \right\} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, by Lemma 31, for any context $\vdash C\{ (T \ ; U) \otimes (V \ ; W) \}$ yields $\vdash C\{ (T \otimes V) \ ; (U \otimes W) \}$, as required. □

▶ **Lemma 39** (Atomic co-interaction). *If* $\vdash C\{ \alpha \otimes \overline{\alpha} \}$ *holds then* $\vdash C\{ \mathrm{I} \}$ *holds.*

Proof. Assume for atom α that $\vdash (\alpha \otimes \overline{\alpha})\sigma \parallel P$, for some predicate P and some substitution σ. By Lemma 27, there exist n-ary killing context $\mathcal{T}\{\ \}$ and predicates U_i and V_i such that $\vdash \alpha\sigma \parallel U_i$ and $\vdash \overline{\alpha\sigma} \parallel V_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, such that $P \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\{ U_1 \parallel V_1, U_2 \parallel V_2, \ldots \}$. By Lemma 29, for every i, there exist m_i^0-ary killing contexts $\mathcal{T}_i^0\{\ \}$ such that $U_i \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}_i^0\{ \overline{\alpha\sigma}, \ldots, \overline{\alpha\sigma} \}$. By Lemma 29, for every i, there exist m_i^1-ary killing contexts $\mathcal{T}_i^1\{\ \}$ such that $V_i \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}_i^0\{ \alpha\sigma, \ldots, \alpha\sigma \}$. Thereby the following

proof can be constructed.

$$\begin{array}{rl} P \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\{\, U_1 \parr V_1, U_2 \parr V_2, \dots \,\} \\ \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\Big\{ \mathcal{T}_i^0\Big\{ \overline{\alpha\sigma} \colon 1 \le j \le m_i^0 \Big\} \parr \mathcal{T}_i^1\Big\{ \alpha\sigma \colon 1 \le k \le m_i^1 \Big\} : 1 \le i \le n \Big\} \\ \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\Big\{ \mathcal{T}_i^1\Big\{ \mathcal{T}_i^0\Big\{ \overline{\alpha\sigma} \colon 1 \le j \le m_i^0 \Big\} \parr \alpha\sigma \colon 1 \le k \le m_i^1 \Big\} : 1 \le i \le n \Big\} \\ \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\Big\{ \mathcal{T}_i^1\Big\{ \mathcal{T}_i^0\Big\{ \overline{\alpha\sigma} \parr \alpha\sigma \colon 1 \le j \le m_i^0 \Big\} : 1 \le k \le m_i^1 \Big\} : 1 \le i \le n \Big\} \\ \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}\Big\{ \mathcal{T}_i^1\Big\{ \mathcal{T}_i^0\Big\{ \mathrm{I} \colon 1 \le j \le m_i^0 \Big\} : 1 \le k \le m_i^1 \Big\} : 1 \le i \le n \Big\} \longrightarrow \mathrm{I} \end{array}$$

Therefore, by Lemma 31, for any context $C\{\ \}$, $\vdash C\{\, \alpha \otimes \overline{\alpha} \,\}$ yields that $\vdash C\{\, \mathrm{I} \,\}$, as required. □

The Proof of Theorem 4. The main result of this paper follows by induction on the structure of P in a predicate of the form $\vdash C\Big\{\, P \otimes \overline{P} \,\Big\}$, by applying the above eight co-rule elimination lemmas and also Lemma 10 in the cases for *with* and *plus*, and Lemma 11 in the cases for *all* and *some*.
Proof. The base cases for any atom α follows since if $\vdash C\{\, \overline{\alpha} \otimes \alpha \,\}$ then $\vdash C\{\, \mathrm{I} \,\}$ by Lemma 39. The base case for the unit is immediate.

As the induction hypothesis in the following cases assume for any context $C\{\ \}$, $\vdash C\Big\{\, T \otimes \overline{T} \,\Big\}$ yields $C\{\, \mathrm{I} \,\}$ and $\vdash \mathcal{D}\Big\{\, U \otimes \overline{U} \,\Big\}$ yields $\mathcal{D}\{\, \mathrm{I} \,\}$.

Consider the case for *times*. Assume that $\vdash C\Big\{\, T \otimes U \otimes \Big(\overline{T} \parr \overline{U}\Big) \,\Big\}$ holds. By the *switch* rule, $\vdash C\Big\{\, \Big(T \otimes \overline{T}\Big) \parr \Big(U \otimes \overline{U}\Big) \,\Big\}$ holds. Hence, by the induction hypothesis twice, $\vdash C\{\, \mathrm{I} \,\}$ holds. The case for when *par* is symmetric to the case for *times*.

Consider the case for *seq*. Assume that $\vdash C\Big\{\, (T \mathbin{;} U) \otimes \Big(\overline{T} \mathbin{;} \overline{U}\Big) \,\Big\}$ holds. By Lemma 38, $\vdash C\Big\{\, \Big(T \otimes \overline{T}\Big) \mathbin{;} \Big(U \otimes \overline{U}\Big) \,\Big\}$ holds. Hence, by the induction hypothesis twice, $\vdash C\{\, \mathrm{I} \,\}$ holds.

Consider the case for *with*. Assume that $\vdash C\Big\{\, (T \mathbin{\&} U) \otimes \Big(\overline{T} \oplus \overline{U}\Big) \,\Big\}$ holds. By Lemma 36, it holds that $\vdash C\Big\{\, \Big((T \mathbin{\&} U) \otimes \overline{T}\Big) \oplus \Big((T \mathbin{\&} U) \otimes \overline{U}\Big) \,\Big\}$. By Lemma 10 twice, $\vdash C\Big\{\, \Big(T \otimes \overline{T}\Big) \oplus \Big(U \otimes \overline{U}\Big) \,\Big\}$ holds. Hence by the induction hypothesis twice, $\vdash C\{\, \mathrm{I} \oplus \mathrm{I} \,\}$ holds. Hence by Lemma 37, $\vdash C\{\, \mathrm{I} \,\}$ holds, as required. The case for *plus* is symmetric to the case for *with*.

Consider the case for universal quantification. Assume that $\vdash C\Big\{\, \forall x T \otimes \exists x \overline{T} \,\Big\}$ holds. By Lemma 34, it holds that $\vdash C\Big\{\, \exists x \Big(\forall x T \otimes \overline{T}\Big) \,\Big\}$, since $x \# \exists x T$. By Lemma 11, $\vdash C\Big\{\, \exists x \Big(T \otimes \overline{T}\Big) \,\Big\}$ holds. Hence by the induction hypothesis, $\vdash C\{\, \exists x \mathrm{I} \,\}$ holds. Hence by Lemma 35, $\vdash C\{\, \mathrm{I} \,\}$ holds, as required. The case for existential quantification is symmetric to the case for universal quantification.

Consider the case for *new*. Assume that $\vdash C\Big\{\, \mathit{N} x T \otimes \Im x \overline{T} \,\Big\}$ holds. By Lemma 32, it holds that $\vdash C\Big\{\, \Im x \Big(T \otimes \overline{T}\Big) \,\Big\}$. Hence by the induction hypothesis, $\vdash C\{\, \Im x \mathrm{I} \,\}$ holds. Hence by Lemma 33, $\vdash C\{\, \mathrm{I} \,\}$ holds, as required. The case for *wen* is symmetric to the case for *new*.

This completes the case analysis. Therefore, by induction on the size of the predicate T, if $\vdash C\Big\{\, T \otimes \overline{T} \,\Big\}$ holds, then $\vdash C\{\, \mathrm{I} \,\}$ holds. □

A symmetric term rewriting system. Suppose that SMAV1 is the system MAV1 extended with all co-rules. The following corollary is a consequence of Theorem 4.

▶ **Corollary 40.** *$\vdash V \multimap U$ if and only if $U \longrightarrow V$ in SMAV1.*

The advantage of the definition of linear implication using provability, is that MAV1 is *analytic* [10]; hence, with some care taken for existential quantifiers [7], each predicate gives rise to finitely many derivations up-to congruence. In contrast, in SMAV1 many co-rules can be applied indefinitely.

4 Decidability of Proof Search

Here we identify complexity classes for proof search in fragments of MAV1. The hardness results in this section are consequences of cut elimination (Theorem 4) and established complexity results for

fragments of linear logic and extensions of BV.

NEXPTIME-hardness follows from the NEXPTIME-harness of MALL1 [28]; while membership in NEXPTIME follows a similar argument as for MALL1 [30] (in a proof there are at most exponentially many *atomic interaction* rules, each involving quadratically bounded terms).

▶ **Proposition 41.** *Deciding provability in MAV1 is NEXPTIME-complete.*

If we restrict terms to a nominal type, i.e. *some* can only be instantiated with variables and constants, we obtain a tighter complexity bound. PSPACE-hardness is a consequence of the PSPACE-hardness of MAV [23], which in turn follows from the PSPACE-hardness of MALL [27]. Membership in PSPACE follows a similar argument as for MALL1 without function symbols [28].

▶ **Proposition 42.** *Deciding provability in MAV1 without function symbols is PSPACE-complete.*

If we consider the sub-system without *with* and *plus*, named BV1, we obtain a tighter complexity bound again, even with function symbols in terms. NP-hardness is a consequence of the NP-hardness of BV [24]; while membership in NP follows a similar argument as for MLL1 [30]

▶ **Proposition 43.** *Deciding provability in BV1 is NP-complete.*

By the above observations, the complexity of deciding linear implication for embeddings of finite name passing processes, as in π-calculus, is in PSPACE. However, extending to finite value passing processes where terms constructed using function symbols can be communicated, e.g. capturing tuples in the polyadic π-calculus [34], the complexity class increases, but only for processes involving choice. Further extensions to MAV1 introducing second-order quantifiers, exponentials or fixed points would lead to undecidable proof search [26, 29, 44].

5 Conclusion

From a proof theoretic perspective this paper makes two significant contributions: a novel dual pair of nominal quantifiers and the first direct cut elimination result for first-order quantifiers in the calculus of structures. The nominal quantifiers *new* and *wen* are distinguished by how they distribute over positive and negative operators; thereby offering greater control of the bookkeeping of names compared to established self-dual nominal quantifiers. This greater control bookkeeping of names enables private names to be modelled in direct embeddings of processes-as-predicates in MAV1.

The cut elimination result (Theorem 4) checks that *new* and *wen* coexist happily with multiplicative, additive, and first-order quantifiers, including the self-dual non-commutative operator *seq*. As a consequence of cut-elimination, we also obtain the first consistent proof system that features both non-commutative operator *seq* and first-order quantifiers. This result is achieved by adapting methods developed for a sub-system MAV; whereby it is observed that there is direct proof of co-rule elimination for universal quantifiers (Lemma 11), that simplifies splitting (Lemma 27), and that context reduction can be adapted for existential quantifiers by working up-to substitutions (Lemma 31).

This paper is part of a line of work on logical systems defined using the calculus of structures with applications to the analysis of protocols [9, 14, 23]. Our approach is distinct from related work [2, 5, 16, 48] where processes are embedded as terms in logic, rather than predicates, and the operational semantics is given either as an inductive definition or a logical theory. In that distinct approach, only the diagonalization property of the nominal quantifier is needed to prove the adequacy of the embeddings (see e.g., [48]). A drawback of that approach is that logical equivalence cannot be directly used to characterise process equivalence. Our approach is also distinct from the proofs-as-processes Curry-Howard inspired approach to session types [11, 12, 52]. Instead, we adopt a processes-as-predicates approach setting up a discussion on the relationship between linear implication

in MAV1 and observational preorders, to be elaborated in future work. We emphasise, that the cut elimination result (Theorem 4) is a prerequisite for further discussion on processes-as-predicates. The complexity results (Propositions 41, 42 and 43) will help guide tool support.

Acknowledgements The first two authors receive support from MOE Tier 2 grant MOE2014-T2-2-076. The last two authors are supported by ANCS grant number PN-II-ID-PCE-2011-3-0919.

References

1 Luca Aceto and Matthew Hennessy. Adding action refinement to a finite process algebra. *Information and Computation*, 115(2):179–247, 1994.

2 Andrei Alexandru and Gabriel Ciobanu. Nominal techniques for πI-calculus. *Romanian Journal of Information Science and Technology*, 16(4):261–286, 2013.

3 Jean-Marc Andreoli. Logic programming with focusing proofs in linear logic. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 2(3):297–347, 1992.

4 Marek Bednarczyk. Hereditary history preserving bisimulations. Technical report, Polish Academy of Sciences, Gdańsk, 1991.

5 Jesper Bengtson and Joachim Parrow. Formalising the π-calculus using nominal logic. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 5(2), 2009.

6 Richard Blute, Prakash Panangaden, and Sergey Slavnov. Deep inference and probabilistic coherence spaces. *Applied Categorical Structures*, 20(3):209–228, 2012.

7 Kai Brünnler. *Deep inference and symmetry in classical proofs*. PhD thesis, TU Dresden, 2003.

8 Kai Brünnler. Locality for classical logic. *Notre Dame J. Form. Log.*, 47(4):557–580, 2006.

9 Paola Bruscoli. A purely logical account of sequentiality in proof search. In *International Conference on Logic Programming*, volume 2401 of *LNCS*, pages 302–316. Springer, 2002.

10 Paola Bruscoli and Alessio Guglielmi. On the proof complexity of deep inference. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic (TOCL)*, 10(2), 2009.

11 Luís Caires and Frank Pfenning. Session types as intuitionistic linear propositions. In *CONCUR 2010*, pages 222–236. Springer, 2010.

12 Marco Carbone, Fabrizio Montesi, Carsten Schürmann, and Nobuko Yoshida. Multiparty session types as coherence proofs. In *CONCUR 2015*, volume 42 of *LIPIcs*, pages 412–426, 2015.

13 Kaustuv Chaudhuri, Nicolas Guenot, and Lutz Straßburger. The focused calculus of structures. In *EACSL*, volume 12, pages 159–173, 2011.

14 Gabriel Ciobanu and Ross Horne. Behavioural analysis of sessions using the calculus of structures. In *PSI 2015, 25-27 August, Kazan, Russia*, LNCS, 2016. in press.

15 Nachum Dershowitz and Zohar Manna. Proving termination with multiset orderings. *Communications of the ACM*, 22(8):465–476, 1979.

16 Murdoch J. Gabbay. The π-calculus in FM. In *Thirty Five Years of Automating Mathematics*, pages 247–269. Springer, 2003.

17 Andrew Gacek, Dale Miller, and Gopalan Nadathur. Nominal abstraction. *Information and Computation*, 209(1):48–73, 2011.

18 Jean-Yves Girard. Linear logic. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 50(1):1–112, 1987.

19 Alessio Guglielmi. Re:encoding pi calculus in calculus of structures. post on public mailing list `http://permalink.gmane.org/gmane.science.mathematics.frogs/161`, 2004.

20 Alessio Guglielmi. A system of interaction and structure. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic*, 8, 2007.

21 Alessio Guglielmi and Lutz Straßburger. A system of interaction and structure V: The exponentials and splitting. *Math. Struct. Comp. Sci.*, 21(03):563–584, 2011.

22 Kohei Honda et al. Scribbling interactions with a formal foundation. In *ICDCIT 2011*, volume 6536 of *LNCS*, pages 55–75. Springer, 2011.

23 Ross Horne. The consistency and complexity of multiplicative additive system virtual. *Sci. Ann. Comp. Sci.*, 25(2):245–316, 2015.

24 Ozan Kahramanoğulları. System BV is NP-complete. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 152(1-3):107–121, 2008.

25 Naoki Kobayashi and Akinori Yonezawa. ACL – a concurrent linear logic programming paradigm. In *ILPS'93*, pages 279–294. MIT Press, 1993.

26 Yves Lafont. The undecidability of second order linear logic without exponentials. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 61(02):541–548, 1996.

27 Patrick Lincoln, John Mitchell, Andre Scedrov, and Natarajan Shankar. Decision problems for propositional linear logic. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 56(1):239–311, 1992.

28 Patrick Lincoln and Andre Scedrov. First-order linear logic without modalities is NEXPTIME-hard. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 135(1):139–153, 1994.

29 Patrick Lincoln, Andre Scedrov, and Natarajan Shankar. Decision problems for second-order linear logic. In *LICS 1995*, pages 476–485. IEEE Computer Society, 1995.

30 Patrick Lincoln and Natarajan Shankar. Proof search in first-order linear logic and other cut-free sequent calculi. In *LICS'94*, pages 282–291. IEEE, 1994.

31 José Meseguer. Conditional rewriting logic as a unified model of concurrency. *Theoretical computer science*, 96(1):73–155, 1992.

32 Dale Miller and Alwen Tiu. A proof theory for generic judgements. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic (TOCL)*, 6(4):749–783, 2005.

33 Robin Milner. *Communication and concurrency*, volume 84. Prentice hall, 1989.

34 Robin Milner. The polyadic π-calculus: a tutorial. In Friedrich Bauer, Wilfried Brauer, and Helmut Schwichtenberg, editors, *Logic and Algebra of Specification*, pages 203–246, 1993.

35 Robin Milner, Joachim Parrow, and David Walker. A calculus of mobile processes, I. *Information and computation*, 100(1):1–40, 1992.

36 Peter O'Hearn and David Pym. The logic of bunched implications. *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic*, 5(2):215–244, 1999.

37 Andrew Pitts. Nominal logic, a first order theory of names and binding. *Information and Computation*, 186(2), 2003.

38 Vaughan Pratt. Modelling concurrency with partial orders. *International Journal of Parallel Programming*, 15(1):33–71, 1986.

39 Christian Retoré. Pomset logic: A non-commutative extension of classical linear logic. In Philippe de Groote, editor, *TLCA'97*, volume 1210 of *LNCS*, pages 300–318. Springer, 1997.

40 Luca Roversi. A deep inference system with a self-dual binder which is complete for linear lambda calculus. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 2014.

41 Davide Sangiorgi. π-calculus, internal mobility, and agent-passing calculi. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 167(1):235–274, 1996.

42 Vladimiro Sassone, Mogens Nielsen, and Glynn Winskel. Models for concurrency: towards a classification. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 170(1-2):297–348, 1996.

43 Lutz Straßburger. *Linear logic and noncommutativity in the calculus of structures*. PhD thesis, TU Dresden, 2003.

44 Lutz Straßburger. System NEL is undecidable. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 84:166–177, 2003.

45 Lutz Straßburger. Some observations on the proof theory of second order propositional multiplicative linear logic. In *TLCA 2009*, volume 5608 of *LNCS*, pages 309–324. Springer, 2009.

46 Lutz Straßburger and Alessio Guglielmi. A system of interaction and structure IV: the exponentials and decomposition. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic (TOCL)*, 12(4):23, 2011.

47 Alwen Tiu. A system of interaction and structure II: The need for deep inference. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 2(2:4):1–24, 2006.

48 Alwen Tiu and Dale Miller. Proof search specifications of bisimulation and modal logics for the π-calculus. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic (TOCL)*, 11(2):13, 2010.

49 Rob van Glabbeek. The linear time-branching time spectrum (extended abstract). In *CONCUR '90*, volume 458 of *LNCS*, pages 278–297. Springer, 1990.

50 Rob van Glabbeek. Structure preserving bisimilarity, supporting an operational petri net semantics of CCSP. In *Correct System Design*, volume 9360 of *LNCS*, pages 99–130. Springer, 2015.

51 Rob van Glabbeek and Ursula Goltz. Refinement of actions and equivalence notions for concurrent systems. *Acta Informatica*, 37(4-5):229–327, 2001.

52 Philip Wadler. Propositions as sessions. *J. of Fun. Prog.*, 24(2-3):384–418, 2014.